00111701

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

# CLARK'S

# FOREIGN

# THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVI.

The Life of Christ—Weiss.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1883.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . . . GEO. HERBERT.

NEW YORK, . . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

# THE

# LIFE OF CHRIST.

BY

DR. BERNHARD WEISS,

COUNSELLOR OF THE CONSISTORY, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN BERLIN.

Translated

By M. G. HOPE.

111701

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1883.

*This Translation is Copyright, by arrangement with the Author.*

111701

00111701

# CONTENTS.

## THIRD BOOK. SEED-TIME.


CHAPTER I.

PAGE

In the Court of the Gentiles, . . . . . 3

CHAPTER II.

Under the Ban of the Hierarchy, . . . . . 18

CHAPTER III.

Beside Jacob's Well, . . . . . 32

CHAPTER IV.

The Return to Galilee, . . . . . 44

CHAPTER V.

In the Synagogue, . . . . . 60

CHAPTER VI.

The Demoniac, . . . . . 76

CHAPTER VII.

At the House of Simon, . . . . . 89

CHAPTER VIII.

By the Lake of Gennesareth, . . . . . 105

CHAPTER IX.

The Friend of Publicans and Sinners, . . . . . 122

CHAPTER X.

On the Mountain of Beatitudes, . . . . . 139

CHAPTER XI.

The Leper, . . . . . 163

CHAPTER XII.

Jairus' Daughter, . . . . . 174

## FOURTH BOOK. THE FIRST CONFLICTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE
The Baptist's Message, . . . . . 189

CHAPTER II.
The Mystery of the Kingdom, . . . . . 203

CHAPTER III.
The First Failure, . . . . . 217

CHAPTER IV.
Sabbatarian Controversy, . . . . . 232

CHAPTER V.
A Fresh Foe, . . . . . 244

CHAPTER VI.
The Twelve, . . . . . 258

CHAPTER VII.
Calumny, . . . . . 276

CHAPTER VIII.
Rupture with the Pharisees, . . . . . 289

CHAPTER IX.
The Mission of the Twelve, . . . . . 306

CHAPTER X.
Rupture with the Hierarchy, . . . . . 322

CHAPTER XI.
The Disciples' Return, . . . . . 333

CHAPTER XII.
Gathering on the Eastern Shore, . . . . . 356

---

## FIFTH BOOK. THE CRISIS.

CHAPTER I.
The Feeling of the Multitudes, . . . . . 375

CHAPTER II.
The Attempt at Insurrection, . . . . . 388

# THIRD BOOK.

## SEED-TIME.

# CHAPTER I.

## IN THE COURT OF THE GENTILES.

THE majestic temple, rising high above the gradually ascending courts, enclosed an extensive outer space, paved with variegated slabs, into which the magnificent outer gates opened directly. This court was surrounded by double and triple arcades, on whose dazzling white marble columns rested roofs of cedar-wood. This was the Court of the Gentiles, so called because even those who were not Jews might walk there as far as the stone railing, which menaced with death any one who penetrated into the higher sanctuary. In this place a market had long been established, where the necessaries for sacrifice were offered for sale in booths, and where money-changers exchanged the currency of the country, and especially that of Jews from abroad, for the stamped double drachma in which the temple tribute had to be paid. Here stood the cattle dealers who sold the animals for sacrifice—oxen, heifers, and lambs; there, beside their cages, sat the sellers of doves, proffering to the poor what they required for sacrifice. Oil and wine, salt and incense,—the accessories to the sacrifice,—were kept ready within the booths. The market, which perhaps had in earlier days been held without the sanctuary, had probably made its way by degrees within the sacred enclosure, and continued to make an unseemly encroachment. There was disputing at the tables of the money-changers, bargaining and chaffering at the traders' booths and beside the live-stock. The brisker the trade at a festival such as the Passover, the more did the gay throng and the loud noise disturb the devotions of those who entered the sanctuary with serious purposes, and the usury and deceit, inseparably associated with such doings, desecrated the holy places scandalously. The multitude was accustomed to it, and the interests of the leaders of the people were affected by the

fact that the ample participation in the sacrifice, and the punctual payment of the temple tribute, were made more convenient for the people; every finer religious sentiment, however, must have revolted against this state of things.

When Jesus entered the temple and again saw this disorder, which had doubtless vexed Him sorely on many an earlier visit, He knew then that His hour was come; He felt that now an opportunity was given Him for coming forward publicly. Condemning this violation of the temple with terrible words out of the prophets, He seized some cords lying upon the ground, twisted them together, and with His own hand began to drive out the sheep and oxen. While the amazed cattle dealers hastened after their animals, Jesus, acting like one of the old prophets when under the influence of the Spirit of Jehovah, turned in holy wrath upon the usurers, He poured their valuable change on the slabs of the floor, and overthrew their tables. Only the dove sellers now remained, standing in helpless bewilderment beside their cages. Their seats He overturned, and commanded them to "Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise" (John ii. 14–16).

Jesus had assuredly no actual right to interfere. It was the duty of the supreme ecclesiastical court to watch over the purity of worship, and in general to perform the duties of temple police. It has been supposed that zealots were privileged, judging from the action of Phinehas (Num. xxv. 8, 11), but that cannot be held as showing a right sanctioned by use and wont. Deep in the constitution of that Israelitish theocracy, whose highest law was Jehovah's holy will, was the conviction that men, filled by His Spirit, could in His name win acceptance for His will in a way destitute of legal form. It was on this ground that the ancient prophets opposed priestcraft and kingcraft; and in the same way Jesus apprehended His calling as ambassador of God, although for hundreds of years that independent control, exercised by divinely-inspired men, had given place to a frigid legal formality. He knew how to estimate the great significance of this sanctuary for Israel; He was aware that the heart of the nation's religious life throbbed there, and that every pollution of the sanctuary must affect that life disastrously, and

incensed by what He saw, He took redress into His own hands. This violent method of bringing about reform has proved a stumbling-block to some who think they see in it a trace of personal impetuosity, and a colouring due to temperament. But they have not taken into account that this was the condition of immediate success, which is not to be compared with the harm done by the usurers, who had so long defamed God's sanctuary with their avarice. Ought Jesus then to have parleyed with these defilers of the temple, who believed they possessed a right to this sacrilege through their long continuance in it; ought He to have let Himself be derided by them? The success of that bold deed can certainly not be explained by a divine miracle, as the Church Fathers supposed, or even by that wonder which is wrought in our own day by every man who is certain of his ground. The amazed multitude was terrified and disarmed by the overwhelming impression made by this zealot, so animated by holy wrath. All the true friends of law, however, who must long have been grieved by this disorder, would defend the righteousness of His action, thus rendering resistance impossible.

These considerations, however, do not touch the real ground of Jesus' human and divine right,—the unique authorization which He possessed. An attempt has been made to rest this upon a prophecy (Mal. iii. 1–4), which says that, in the Messianic age, Jehovah Himself shall come to His temple, to purify and restore it; on these grounds the action has been regarded as a proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship. It was not that, however, simply because it could not be so understood, for the people had not the prophet's codes at hand, and were little likely to reflect on that remote prophecy. It was an act of reformation, an act by which Jesus, before the whole nation, vindicated His right and duty to interfere in its public life, and in the centre of that life to create what was new; His interference, however, differed from that of the Baptist in extending beyond the life of the individual man. He appeared before the people as one to whom the fulfilment of this duty was of personal consequence, and who was obliged to labour for the accomplishment of the divine will in the midst of the theocratic congregation, simply because He could not do otherwise. Once more, in the words of the

boy of twelve who had spoken in this very place, He called this temple the house—not "of our Father," nor "of your Father," but "of my Father." He felt Himself to be the Son of Him who in a unique way had consecrated this place for His temple, and He exercised the authority of a son against the turmoil which defiled His Father's house. Those who looked deeper must ultimately have seen that the Messiah alone had a right to feel Himself in this sense the Chosen of Jehovah. As yet, however, there were no such profound observers. The followers, by whom He was already surrounded, did not require to deduce His Messiahship from this; they knew He was the Messiah. That unheard-of proceeding on the part of their Master, which produced blank amazement even in them, they may have endeavoured to explain by searching out some statement in the prophets that appeared to foretell it. If so, they found one in a psalm in which, according to the Messianic interpretation, the Messiah (lxix. 10) prayed to God, "The zeal of Thine house shall eat me up" (John ii. 17). Did they not see before their eyes how zeal was consuming Him? If this were the beginning, what would then the end be?

But was it in very deed the beginning? The older tradition relates the self-same occurrence immediately after the triumphal entrance with palms at the last Passover (Mark xi. 15–17), and apologetics considers itself bound to assume a repetition of the same incident. It is well known, indeed, that deeply-rooted abuses are not reformed at once. May this one not have crept in again, and needed another exertion of Jesus' power to put an end to it? May the same thing not have happened at each of His visits to the temple? Oxen and sheep, tables of money, and cages of doves there must have been on both occasions; so far there is a similarity between the two narratives. One thing only is forgotten. What the first time was a bold action, a powerful sermon in deeds, was in its repetition nothing but the exercise of the duties of the temple officers, a matter with which Jesus had nothing to do. Besides, the cattle dealers and usurers of Jerusalem would hardly be so simple as to allow themselves to be surprised a second time by a Galilean fanatic; in the event of the disorder being actually set up again, they would

know well how to secure continuous protection at the hands of the temple police against such outrages of a religious enthusiast on their piles of gold and herds of cattle. If, notwithstanding all this, the incident actually took place a second time, it is still most remarkable that tradition should have been so exactly divided; and that the fact of the second occurrence being nothing but a repetition of the first, is not betrayed even by the slightest indication or reference. If the incident really happened only once, we shall be compelled to agree with John in placing it during Jesus' first visit to the feast.[1] Moreover, during that last visit to the feast, when the popular enthusiasm found expression in the Messiah's triumphal procession, Jesus appears to have maintained a reserve which He was absolutely without at the time of His first appearance. To search anxiously for such a reserve, however, robs the act of Jesus of the true greatness which does what duty commands, come what may; in reality there was no necessity for reserve, for every pious Israelite must have approved in heart of this bold deed. But if Jesus ever pondered the course of events, surely the great tension of the situation at the last feast would have hindered him from hastening the catastrophe by such a provocation.[2] What, indeed, could Jesus have intended by such a provocation at His last feast? It is comprehensible why He should begin by seeking the nation at the centre of its religious life, in order to acquire influence over it, and why He should testify against the disturbance and the envenoming of the national religious

[1] Modern criticism affirms, indeed, that, as opposed to John, the older tradition must be correct, and that the Fourth Gospel only anticipated the occurrence in order—it is not easily understood why—to antedate Jesus' public appearance, and His break with the dominant Judaism. But, then, this reformatory act was far from having an express Messianic character, and it could not bring about a rupture, since it was impossible for the authorities in Jerusalem openly to proclaim themselves patrons of this disorder. It is vain for criticism to boast in this case of the "completed tradition of the older Gospels." We have seen already how the first and third evangelists borrowed their whole historical framework from Mark, and this incident, therefore, along with all the other traditionary events which took place in Jerusalem, they must have placed, like him, in that single visit to the feast of which he tells.

[2] Mark is perfectly right when he says that *in that situation* the execution of Jesus could be the only answer given to such a demonstration (Mark xi. 18); but, taken by itself, there was nothing in this action of one totally unknown to them that would suggest murderous schemes to the hierarchy

observances by contemptible love of gain. But characteristic as this reformatory action was as an opening to Jesus' public ministry, it seems to serve no purpose at the close. At that time He had long given up the nation as a whole, and had in the most unmistakeable way proclaimed the fall of the temple. Would He then have cleansed this temple, destined to destruction, besides protecting it from desecration?[1]

If the fourth evangelist had ever remodelled the history contained in the older tradition, he would doubtless either have enriched or altered it in accordance with his new ideas; and yet we find that the older narrative is almost word for word identical with his. There is one touch in Mark which appeared unimportant to the later narrator, whose attention was directed to the main point. It was not merely the desecration of the temple by buying and selling which Jesus put a stop to. It was a usual thing for the courts of the temple to be abused by using them as a short cut, in order to avoid making a circuit, and for people to pass through them laden with household utensils. This Jesus would not permit (Mark xi. 16). It is alleged, indeed, that the fourth evangelist exaggerated Jesus' zealotry by representing Him as scattering the coins and making use of the scourge. But even the older narrative suffers Him to overturn the tables, which could not but involve the scattering of the money; and the whole scene is made comprehensible by the employment of the scourge, which was certainly not intended to be applied to the dealers, but to the cattle. It is certainly not easy to understand how Jesus, with His own hand, could address Himself to the task of driving out the dealers, although

[1] Critics, such as Strauss and Schenkel, knew well what they were doing when they saw in this act a demonstration against the entire sacrificial ceremonial, and an expression of Jesus' abhorrence of the crass materialism of the sacrificial worship; or when they made it refer to the close of the entire temple service and to the new temple He wished to inaugurate for all nations. But if so, then this alleged purpose of the cleansing of the temple would be in absolute contradiction with what we gather from it concerning the inviolability of the temple, and so, therefore, of the service for which it was intended. Keim has already confessed that this theory contradicts the entire historical position of Jesus towards the Old Testament, which could only be and, as we shall learn from indisputable witnesses, was a conservative one. The demonstration as a whole, therefore, would be absolutely meaningless in the circumstances attending the last visit to Jerusalem.

it is not unlikely that they should make their exit when commanded to follow their animals.[1]

On the other hand, it is this fourth evangelist who exaggerated the zeal of Jesus, who is said to have softened down His reproof, and—most improbably—to have weakened the vigorous quotation from the old prophet into a colourless prohibition of buying and selling in the temple. Conversely, it would be perfectly conceivable that oral tradition should clothe, in the words of an Old Testament prophet, the reproof given by Jesus, since it was no longer accurately remembered. Although John recounts only a single remark directed by Jesus to the dove sellers, we cannot possibly imagine Him to have performed the whole of the preceding act in silence, for it was really the burning words which accompanied it that gave it true significance and produced such an effect. It is indeed clearly indicated by Mark himself that the quotation from the prophet, given by him also, was only a *moment* in Jesus' address, by which He stigmatized the disorder as violation of the temple (Mark xi. 17). By a powerful quotation from Jeremiah (vii. 11) He had reproached them with making this house a den of robbers, in order that He might rightly characterize as outrageous robbery the fraud and deceit inseparable from this buying and selling; and by the words from Isaiah He contrasted this with the high and holy destiny of this house: "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people" (Isa. lvi. 7).[2] This portion of

[1] In any case, it is not comprehensible how the accomplished Alexandrine, to whom the Gospel is attributed, could in addition invent the scourge, which proved an especial stumbling-block to Origen, and was in general regarded as mere symbolism. It is in the Fourth Gospel, too, that the distinction is made apparent, although drawn by the older narrative also, between the sellers of doves and the other cattle dealers. It was certainly a strange idea to look upon their treatment as having been gentler, because they offered for sale what formed the sacrifice of the poor; for they profited no less than the other profaners of the temple. The truth is, that He could not drive out their animals like those of the others. Indeed, if the words are to be taken literally, zealotism is more intense in the older narration, where Jesus not only expels the sellers, but along with them the buyers,—a fact which to the intelligent reader is a matter of course.

[2] Because the concluding words are lacking in the other Gospels, it has been conjectured by an ultra-refined criticism, that Mark, by reason of his affinities with the Gentiles, desired to introduce some kind of dogmatic reference to the reception of Gentiles into the Church, although it is difficult to understand how he could forebode it in this connection. It was overlooked that this would

the temple was, in truth, exclusively a house of prayer; for the Gentiles who came up to the feasts, and obtained admittance to this court, did not come to take part in the sacrificial worship of Israel, — *that* they might not do, unless they incorporated themselves with the consecrated people by the rite of circumcision, — but to worship Israel's God (John xii. 20). It was the devotions of the Gentiles which Israel disturbed by the requirements of its sacrificial ceremonial, — a fact which made Jesus seize on those words of Isaiah. What a marvellous dispensation! The Messiah of Israel stood for the first time before the people to whom He had dedicated His entire ministry with almost painful exclusiveness, and yet the first censure of this His people made Him the advocate of those who would one day enter on Israel's inheritance.

This audacious proceeding on the part of Jesus caused painful embarrassment to the heads of the people. For weighty reasons they could not oppose it without placing themselves in flagrant opposition to the conscience of the people, which had spoken sufficiently loud by its approving silence. Still less could they recognise this action of Jesus, if they would not compromise themselves most grievously, for it was they who had so long suffered this disorder to exist in spite of their superior knowledge and clear conviction; that would have been to acknowledge the divine right of the Galilean who, taking their place, did what it was their duty to have done long before. The first reason forbade them to strive after the popular favour upon which their entire authority actually depended, and on account of which alone the rulers had left them what authority they still possessed; the second would seem to wound their honour yet more, and to transfer it to an unknown upstart. They therefore decided to weaken His procedure on grounds of formality, and to demand His legitimation for it (John ii. 18). A correct reminiscence of this is preserved in the older Gospels (Mark xi. 27 f.), which is the more important because, owing to the

make Jesus' utterance incomprehensible; for the temple is by no means a house of prayer, in the first place, but is intended for totally different purposes. Indeed, the expounders of this view have, down to the present day, forgotten where the scene took place—viz. in the Court of the Gentiles.

environment in which these Gospels placed the cleansing of the temple, it was impossible for them to maintain the relation between this and the question of authority, or to preserve the original answer.[1] If Jesus reformed the disorder in the temple in a despotic way, it would certainly be asked by what authority He did so. To this question, however, He could not give a concise and complete answer. It was perfectly plain to Him that what He claimed was to be the Messiah, and yet we see from the older Gospels how He refrained from a direct confession of His Messiahship before the people, and this for good reasons, which we shall understand later on. It was on this very account that He began His public ministry with an action which in no way advanced a direct claim to this Messianic authority. But it was impossible for Him to qualify the authority by which He accomplished this action by calling it the prophetical merely, that would have seemed to involve a renunciation of the far higher calling He was conscious of. He therefore answered enigmatically, preserving in His own view an absolute claim to Messianic authority, although in this sense the response could

[1] The older Gospels admit with perfect justice that on the occasion of that last visit to the Passover, in which they place the purification of the temple, the only question upon which it could bear must have been the Messiahship of Jesus, although there is no reference to this in the act itself. For that reason Mark expressly extends the reference to the question of authority in analogous encroachments, thinking apparently of the Messianic demonstration at the triumphal entrance (xi. 28). The other two evangelists (Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 1) give special prominence to Jesus' teaching in the temple, an action which certainly required no special authority, for the liberty of teaching one's own views publicly was usual in Israel. Luke says, though the others do not, that this teaching referred to the glad tidings of the approaching divine kingdom. The evangelists, however, did not take into account that in these circumstances any question as to authority would be historically incomprehensible, for Jesus, by permitting Himself to be honoured as the Messiah on the occasion of His entrance into Jerusalem, left no doubt as to the kind of authority He claimed. All that therefore remained to question was the right He had to lay claim to Messianic authority; and it is to this the conversation refers, which, according to Mark xi. 29 f., they connect with the question of authority, and which indeed cannot have occurred during the first visit. Jesus had not then appeared as the Messiah, and He distinctly assumes the Baptist's ministry to be at an end (Mark xi. 30), which at this time was certainly not the case (John iii. 24). We shall see, on the other hand, that they could not give the original answer to that question as to authority, the proper interpretation of which Mark had retained, because it pointed to a future which at the last visit had long pertained to the past.

neither be understood by the questioners nor by the people, nor was it intended that it should be (John ii. 19).

This enigmatical utterance has been subjected to very varied interpretations, not only at the time it was spoken, but at a later date in the remembrance of the Church, and even at the present day disagreement still exists as to what its original meaning was. It was never forgotten that Jesus had spoken of the destruction and the rebuilding of the temple. Even after a lapse of two years this saying was recollected by every one, and at the last He was assailed with the mocking cry, "Ha! thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down from the cross" (Mark xv. 29 f.). This had then been understood as an empty vaunt, as if Jesus had attributed to Himself the miraculous power of being able to carry out the rebuilding of the temple in three days. It is useless to appeal to the fact of these words being still remembered at the time of the crucifixion as affording ground for the assertion that they were not spoken till the last visit. To do so is to overlook the important part which this utterance played in the trial of Jesus (Mark xiv. 57 f.), and the probability of its being on this account familiar to every one. Indeed, when speaking of the trial, Mark says that the actual expression on which everything depended could at that time be no longer accurately fixed (ver. 59). It is, however, manifestly inconceivable that a statement could not be verified which was a few days previously addressed by Jesus to those who were now His judges. The trial of Jesus did not succeed in finding the true meaning of the assertion to be contained in that boast, or did so only in so far as every assumption of a rebuilding involved the idea of His being able to put something better in the room of the ancient sanctuary; the gravamen of the offence consisted rather in His having declared that He wished to cast down the existing sanctuary. The older tradition, however, expressly says that the statement was reported in this form by false witnesses;[1] and yet there

[1] In the same way Stephen was accused by false witnesses of having referred to this assertion of his Master, correctly interpreting it as meaning that Jesus had intended thereby the overthrow of the whole system of worship (Acts vi. 13 f.). Strauss and Schenkel think even now that Jesus' statement must

is not a vestige in the older tradition from which to glean the original meaning of the saying, for the form current was, of course, the false one which had been given to it intentionally. For the true form we must go to John's Gospel.[1] Jesus did not say that He would pull down the temple, but not without delicate irony He commanded the hierarchy to do it themselves, *i.e.* to complete the work of destroying this temple of God, which they had begun by tolerating such abuses within it. If each shameless desecration of the temple necessarily aided in poisoning the religious life of the people by transforming the sacrificial ceremonial and the entire temple worship into an outward service of works, then the toleration of such abuses could but lead to the depreciation of the entire Old Testament theocracy which centred in and around the temple, and therefore ultimately to the fall of both. While Jesus showed by this reformatory action how highly He revered this temple, and how little He was minded to cast aside at once the sanctified form of the theocracy as it had been fashioned under God's preparative revelation, it was they, its natural guardians, who were bringing about its certain destruction. If, then, they continued as they had been doing, the responsibility was all their own. Jesus was free from any; they were false witnesses who reported Him to have expressed the wish to proceed to this destruction with His own sacrilegious hand.

actually be apprehended in this sense; but then there is perfect justice in what is said on the other hand, that such an outrage against the temple and the legal order of service is opposed to everything we know regarding Jesus' position towards the Old Testament. In this case there is no connection whatever, for it was Jesus who, fired by holy zeal, sought to defend the temple from desecration. Along with this, Strauss' spiteful supposition falls to the ground, that the older Jewish-Christian tradition endeavoured at first to disown these words, which must have been most unpalatable to the Jews; it was therefore not accepted until the fourth evangelist not only did so, but—it is not possible to understand why—completely re-expounded it, although, according to the conception of his view held by criticism, he could only have superficial sympathy with it.

[1] It is a brilliant confirmation of the historical reminiscences lying at the foundation of the Fourth Gospel, that it alone has preserved for us what is historically the only possible form of this statement. Even a critic like Keim, who regards this Gospel as absolutely unhistorical, declares that the meaning of the statement could only be, that with the rejection of the Messiah the temple must also fall. This is essentially what is understood by John, and by him alone.

In this way the first portion of that enigmatical utterance explains with sufficient clearness why reformatory action was so pressing; but it contains no answer to the question put to Him regarding the nature of the authority, in the strength of which He felt Himself called to interfere against that disorder. He answers this by hinting that He will erect another temple in three days, *i.e.*, according to proverbial language, in the shortest possible space of time (comp. Hos. vi. 2). How this utterance was apprehended in the time of the evangelist Mark is clearly seen from his explanation of it, when it was repeated at the examination of witnesses (Mark xiv. 58). He understood the other temple, made without hands, to be in contradistinction to the house of God, built of stone by the hands of men; but assuredly he had no thought of a new spiritual worship of God, or even of a new economy of religion, although he has been credited with such conceptions. To him, as to his master, Peter (1 Pet. ii. 5, iv. 17), the spiritual temple which Jesus erected was the Church, where God dwelt in a higher sense than in the house of stone. Without a doubt, this oldest interpretation is the correct one. Jehovah had promised from the very beginning to dwell among His people (Ex. xxix. 45 f.), and this promise had been fulfilled symbolically by His being throned in the darkness of the Holy of Holies, above the cherubim, on the ark of the covenant. But even the prophets had pointed out how this promise should in a fuller and deeper sense be fulfilled in the perfected theocracy of the Messianic era (Ezek. xxxvii. 27). This era Jesus had come to bring, and the theocracy would accordingly be perfected in the kingdom of God which He was to establish. And now, when just entering on His public ministry, Jesus looked away to the new temple of the kingdom of God, which He would shortly begin to erect, that God might, in the fullest sense, be able to dwell among His people. These words, therefore, must necessarily have been uttered at His first visit to the Passover, when this kingdom of God had still to be founded; for, at His last visit, it had long been established in the company of disciples, and Jesus could at that time have pointed to this foundation as to a proof of the divine authority which He possessed for His reformatory procedure. For He who

possessed the far higher authority for perfecting the theocracy —a power which would be granted to the Messiah alone— must evidently possess the more limited [prophetical] authority to reform the abuses which cried to heaven from within the old theocracy.

This enigma, however, gave the Church no peace, and constant discoveries were made of profound secrets believed to be hidden in it. When at last, under the guidance of the Spirit, the deepest secret of the Person of Jesus was recognised,—a secret which He had Himself only hinted at by transitory indications,—when He was acknowledged to be the One in whom the Eternal Word had become Flesh, and made its dwelling among men (John i. 14), then it was that His body was first regarded as being the temple of God of which He spoke. The proverbial three days recalled the actual three days His body had lain in the grave; the pulling down of the temple, His death at the hands of the Jews; and the re-erecting of the same, His resurrection. This is the interpretation given by John (ii. 21). It was certainly, however, no answer to that question as to authority, but it *was* an answer to the Jews' demand for a sign (ii. 18).[1] According to John's view, Jesus saw the beginning of the end in the non-receptivity which led them to demand a sign for the act which had already been justified by overwhelming evidence. He saw how this non-receptivity would at last lead to the obduracy which culminated in putting the Messiah to death. He called upon them to proceed to their worst, in order that opportunity might be granted Him of giving the one great proof which His resurrection would afford them. It was to this sign that Jesus referred when a token of His Messiahship was again demanded (Matt. xii. 39 f.); and John, who, in his profound apprehension of the history, everywhere sees the end in the beginning, interpreted that enigmatical utterance by this sign, derived from the history of Jonah.

This was not, however, the original signification of the

[1] Criticism can only explain this by its old allegation that the fourth evangelist redacted synoptic material (Mark viii. 11; Matt. xii. 38). We shall see, however, that he knew right well the historical connection of this demand for a sign (John vi. 30). He saw, therefore, that this was a prelude to it.

words; one reason indeed being, that the Jews could not have demanded a sign on this occasion. A prophetical proceeding like the act of purifying the temple had no need of a token to justify it. The Baptist was regarded by the nation as a great prophet, and yet he did no sign (John x. 41). Besides, there was nothing in the state of the case even to suggest the idea of Jesus' death. It showed great penetration for John to see in the procedure of the hierarchy, who, in place of acknowledging their guilt, began by carping at Jesus' act out of reasons of form, the germ of their subsequent deadly enmity against Him; at the moment there was not the slightest symptom of such hatred, and therefore no occasion for a prophecy which presupposed His death. And yet John must have retained the original form of the word, for he shows that Jesus did not bluntly contrast the existing temple with another one, as would appear from the mingling in Mark of picture and interpretation (xiv. 58). In this way the enigmatical point of the words is removed, and every point of contact is taken from the later interpretation. It rather appears from the popular citation of this saying (Mark xv. 29) that Jesus spoke of the temple He was on the point of erecting, the idea of which had been symbolically realized in the building of stone doomed to destruction by the procedure of the hierarchy, but which would be perfectly realized in the kingdom of God which Jesus came to found.[1] It is evident that the hierarchy could not understand the meaning of this enigma, even in its original form. But it was not their way to trouble themselves about the radical meaning. They were satisfied to keep to the apparent purport, that they might laugh at it as pure absurdity. Forty-six years was this temple in building (comp. vol. i. p. 318), and He thought Himself able to set up such another in three days (John ii. 20).

[1] Jesus certainly did not speak on both occasions of an existing temple as John apprehended it; He could only have done so by referring thereby to His own body. This could only happen, as is acknowledged by the evangelist himself, by the disciples arriving at its meaning after the resurrection of Jesus (ii. 22), and he relates that the hierarchy never thought of Jesus' words as referring to anything but a building of stone (ver. 20). In any case, however, the meaning of His words would remain obscure; but no one could doubt that He spoke of His own body when, pointing to it, He called on the Jews to destroy "*this*" temple, in order that He might raise it again in three days.

Jesus could have no hope of unfolding the meaning of His words to them, for the first conditions of comprehension were awanting. He had to content Himself with turning aside their question as to His authority for doing an act which bore its own justification, with a word containing, as He knew, the profoundest solution, although it was incomprehensible to them. He never laid claim to any authority that interfered with their rights. What had occurred might therefore be covered with the oblivion which they themselves had particular necessity for. That strange zealot, who played with enigmatical utterances when it was necessary to defend pretensions He had boldly advanced, might be permitted to go quietly on His way.

And thus Jesus began His public ministry in Jerusalem without opposition from the governing powers.

## CHAPTER II.

### UNDER THE BAN OF THE HIERARCHY.

BY the cleansing of the temple, Jesus had so purposely drawn public attention to Himself that He could not operate during the remainder of the feast at His own good pleasure, but was compelled to come forward as one who regarded it as His calling to devote Himself to the nation's highest interests. This, however, could only be done by appearing as a teacher, not indeed as one of the incorporated teachers of the law, whose certificates bore the name of some great rabbi at whose feet he had sat, but as a teacher by the grace of God. He did not expect His people to discover this distinction from the manner and the tenor of His doctrine; indeed, His equipment by the Spirit at baptism was for the purpose of enabling Him to make clear to the people, who as yet were sensuously inclined, that He was sent from God. That God was with Him must have been manifest even to the weakest understanding from the miracles He performed (comp. John iii. 2), which probably consisted of extraordinary cures (comp. iv. 45 f.). It is undoubtedly afterwards assumed that His teaching even then did not touch on general religious or ethical truths, but was concerned with a great question, which since the days of the Baptist had excited popular interest—the question as to the Messianic salvation and the coming of the kingdom of God (comp. iii. 3). The scanty account in this source, however, does not permit us to decide to what extent He entered on this question; how far He treated it didactically; or how far He suffered any suspicion to arise of the significance of His Person and appearance for this future.

It is evident that Jesus' appearance must have caused not a little excitement among the multitude assembled at the feast. After more than six months had elapsed, the miraculous cures which this Jesus of Nazareth performed at

Jerusalem were still talked of in Galilee; so much so, indeed, that even an official who had no connection with the people, when he heard of Jesus' arrival in Galilee, turned to Him for help for his invalid son (iv. 45 ff.). It does not follow from this, however, that there existed any true faith in the Messiah.[1] Some there assuredly were who were disposed to see in the Baptist's successor the mighty man of popular expectation; but the great majority of the people would scarcely go so far as to regard His miraculous deeds as the tokens of God's messenger (iii. 2), especially as there was still complete uncertainty about His ultimate designs, even if any were sufficiently interested to reflect upon them. In any case, the whole behaviour of Jesus leaves no doubt of His having clearly seen the real reason for the approbation He met with (ii. 23–25). But this could only be perceived by one who had a standard for estimating the variations in Jesus' demeanour from the way in which He devoted Himself to His first true followers. Jesus did not trust Himself unto them, says John, even where He was met with apparent readiness to believe. He did not speak so openly as in the circle of His disciples; His whole didactic ministry was of an elementary description, and continued so to the end. He did nothing by which to bind this circle more firmly to Himself in order to form a narrower circle of disciples, as was afterwards the case in Galilee, but was contented with making a transient impression. The evangelist is indisputably right in specifying as the reason why Jesus did not allow Himself to be deceived by outward approbation, based really on the impression made by His miraculous deeds, that He saw how far this enthusiasm was from promising a genuine receptivity for the best He had to bring. He perceived that these suggestions did not penetrate deeply, even in the case of His narrower-minded countrymen.

[1] The manner in which the evangelist describes the belief in Jesus' Person, which was founded upon those miracles (John ii. 23), is no guarantee of His having been then called by the name which the adoration of the people gave Him later, as the God-chosen bringer of that future. This is partly owing to the evangelist's way of not distinguishing distinctly the degrees of faith of which he speaks; partly to the fact that at the time when he wrote, he could scarcely be able to separate from one another with historical clearness the peculiarities of the faith which Jesus encountered at different epochs in His ministry.

In the case of the inhabitants of the capital, who were specially affected by His ministry at the feast, the non-receptivity which Jesus found opposed to Him had another ground. People were there accustomed to receive direction and guidance in all religious matters from the hierarchy, who had their seat and exercised their most direct influence in Jerusalem. It is a complete perversion of the state of the case to affirm, as is done by some, that the fourth evangelist represents Jesus and the hierarchy as being at downright enmity with each other from the very first, while not a single hostile step is recorded. Every one must acknowledge, however, that the priesthood cannot have been very favourably disposed towards Him after His appearance in the temple; there would be, in consequence, little inclination in the capital to join one who had dared to embarrass the heads of the people. A populace burdened with the pressure of a hierarchy is difficult to move spiritually, and what affected the remainder of the gathering was not sufficient to give an impulsion worthy of mention. Among the inhabitants of the capital, Jesus encountered undoubtedly an exceedingly frigid reserve; and even where a measure of interest was excited, it could not be given expression to so long as the leaders of the people kept silence. Any who were more intimate with that inner circle would indeed know more exactly how Jesus was there regarded. It is contrary to the nature of any hierarchy to recognise an authority which it has not legitimized. Before the leading circle had uttered a single hostile word against Jesus, He stood under their ban. No one could feel this more than the members of the Sanhedrim itself. Even when one of them, an honoured scribe of the Pharisaical party, Nakdimon by name (Nicodemus, comp. iii. 1, 10), was so moved by Jesus that he determined to seek Him out personally, he did not venture to do so in daylight (iii. 2). His colleagues might not know that he cultivated intercourse with the Galilean. What we are told of this transaction is the only thing that gives us a deeper insight into the actual situation and the ministry of Jesus.[1]

[1] As the motive of the invention of this whole narrative, Strauss was satisfied with the desire of removing the reproach from Christianity of its having found acceptance with common people only. He forgot that Jesus Himself thanked

The way in which the scribe introduced himself is highly characteristic. Like so many others, he declared himself ready to acknowledge Jesus as a God-sent teacher; His miracles, indeed, have attested the fact (iii. 2). He has doubtless observed that Jesus has not yet said all; it would be well, therefore, that Jesus should confide to him, a teacher in Israel, what it is He really has in view, and what the new doctrine is He has come to preach. Jesus, however, refused to comply with this request, and met him with the practical demand for regeneration, which he addressed to every one who would share in the approaching future—the kingdom of God (iii. 3). It was the same call to repentance with which the Baptist appeared, but as directed to a sternly legal-minded man, who, striving in his own way to accomplish the divine will, had refrained from the grosser vices, it rather pointed to the commencement of a new and higher life, in the realization of which he had totally failed.[1] To the self-satisfied Pharisee, such a demand seemed very proper for publicans and sinners, but that Jesus should direct it to him and to others like him, must have appeared perfectly preposterous. It was evidently from no want of comprehension that this theologian, accustomed as he was to the metaphorical language of the Old Testament, appeared unable to understand this remark about a new birth. With a half-ironical reference to the physical impossibility of a fresh start in life, he turned aside each attempt at entering particularly into words so absurd in their literal sense, and out of which he could gather no meaning (iii. 4).

the Lord of heaven and earth that He had hidden these things from the wise and understanding (Matt. xi. 25); and that Paul was not ashamed to confess that not many wise were called (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.). It does not follow from this scene being of representative value for the evangelist, as regards Jesus' whole ministry in Jerusalem, that therefore this Nicodemus is only a typical figure, and the whole conversation a free development of John's theological conceptions. When it used to be doubtingly asked how John got his knowledge of the conversation by night, it was overlooked that the motive for Nicodemus seeking Jesus at nightfall by no means precluded the possibility of the latter being surrounded by His trusty followers.

[1] In the same way Jesus appeared afterwards in Galilee with a call to repentance in view of the coming judgment (Mark i. 15); but except on the present occasion, this idea occurs nowhere else in John.

Just because Nicodemus was not lacking in the capacity of comprehension, which could be increased by further instruction, but in the willingness to take Jesus' command to himself, Jesus simply repeated His demand in answering that a baptism with water, such as John's, was not sufficient; that only portrayed the human resolve to repent, while there was needed in addition the spiritual endowments of the Messianic age. A higher life can only be generated by the Spirit, just as the natural life is incapable of being developed from itself. Nicodemus therefore had no need to be surprised that the demand was of such universal application, for it was not conditioned by any particular degree of sinfulness, but by the universal contrariety between the higher life required by Jesus and the natural one (iii. 5–7). Along with His polemic against the refusal to entertain the idea of the new birth, Jesus shows by a simile how even in this the methods of the higher life have analogies within the domain of the natural life; He probably took His similitude from the wind, because in Hebrew, as in Greek, Spirit and wind are denoted by one word. Of course, the nature and course of such a birth from the Spirit cannot be theoretically demonstrated, it must be experienced practically. As the blowing of the wind is perceived experimentally, without its source or goal being thereby fathomed, so is it with every operation of the Spirit, secret in its course but perceptible in its results (iii. 8). That Nicodemus, in spite of this, should doubt the possibility of such a mysterious event, Jesus regarded as singular in an honoured teacher of Israel (iii. 9 f.). As such, he must have known that the Old Testament Scriptures held forth the prospect of a pouring out of the Spirit in the Messianic age,—a baptism which was to make Israel strong for the service of its God, and must therefore have been capable of developing this new life now required of it; he must have known, too, that the condition of this, as of every other operation of the Spirit, was believing obedience to the word of God's messenger, such as Jesus afterwards demanded (Mark i. 15), and which Nicodemus, by repelling Jesus' challenge, had just refused to yield.[1]

[1] Apart from the genuinely synoptical parable and the Old Testament ideas on which Jesus fastened, the fact of the specifically Johannine idea of a birth from God being as absolutely unlike the birth from the Spirit, which is here

Not until Jesus, through indirect reproof, had reduced him to silence, did Nicodemus disclose the most profound of the reasons which prevented him and others like him from receiving what the new era had in store. He had come to learn; but he repelled what Jesus said, because it contradicted his hereditary views. He lacked readiness to accept the word of God's messenger in its simple literality. In a way which does not occur again, and is therefore undoubtedly original, Jesus here connects Himself with that other messenger of God, whose demand had been equally slighted by men of Nicodemus' own rank and opinions, because it did not correspond with their presuppositions (comp. vol. i. p. 315). And yet the Baptist had only testified to what he himself had experienced when he saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus, just as Jesus spoke of the baptism of the Spirit after He Himself had received it (iii. 11). It is not faith in Jesus' Person, but in His word, which is incumbent upon Nicodemus, after his acknowledgment of Him as sent from God (iii. 2). It was therefore very natural for Jesus to return to the wish with which the scribe had come to Him. He desired to be told what new thing it was Jesus had come to announce. But the news which the Son of man had to proclaim was the divine decree concerning the manner in which He was to bring about the completion of salvation; with this no one, excepting Himself, was acquainted, although He was far from being able to ascend into heaven and bring back knowledge of the divine secrets. On this very account His proclamation, just as it ran, had to be received with willing faith. If Jesus did not find this faith when speaking of earthly things, when telling what He required from men in order that they might be strong and capable for the nearing consummation

developed, as the conception of the Spirit as the principle of the new life differs from the Johannine idea of the Spirit's operations, shows how little this has to do with the development of Johannine ideas. At the utmost, there may be in the ambiguous expression employed by the evangelist in iii. 3 an allusion to the new birth resulting from an operation from above. The passage iii. 5 contains, therefore, no reference to Christian baptism, for John neither regards the birth from God nor the communication of the Spirit as being in any way conjoined with it; so too, in chap. iii. 6, there is no mention of the doctrine of hereditary sin, for according to Johannine language the natural birth is there signified, not the truly spiritual life which is required.

of salvation, how could He hope to find it when speaking of heavenly things? What He had to proclaim concerning these divine decrees would contradict yet further their present conceptions as to this approaching consummation (iii. 12 f.).[1]

Jesus thus seemed to refuse Nicodemus' desire entirely, but still He could not refrain from granting one glance into that world of heavenly things, which disclosed itself so soon as he accepted Jesus' word with unreserved faith. It was certainly necessary for him to know who it was that spoke to him; and Jesus did not conceal from Himself how hard it must be for the Pharisee to recognise the Chosen of God in this plain-looking Rabbi from Nazareth. On this account He pointed to a future, when God had decreed that this should be made plain to all. As Moses once elevated the brazen serpent in the wilderness, in order that by looking upon it in faith the people should recover who were sick unto death (Num. xxi. 8), so too must the God-sent Son of man be lifted up before all people, that He might be recognised as the Messiah of God, and that the people might find salvation through believing trust in Him (iii. 14 f.). What should bring about such an exaltation as would make clear to all who He was, Jesus knew not; as with regard to time and hour, He left the method and the way with gladsome confidence in the hands of His Father in heaven. But wherefore should this future not be already present? wherefore did God

[1] It is incontestable that here the evangelist has introduced into the words of Jesus his profounder knowledge of Christ's higher origin. Only an exegesis which audaciously ignores the purport and connection could discover in chap. iii. 13 an allusion to the ascension; but the remark about ascending into heaven evidently put the evangelist in mind of Christ's descent from heaven, which presupposed His original existence there; this explains, too, the correspondences with the prologue in iii. 11 (comp. i. 7, 11), and with the direct knowledge which Christ there has of heavenly things. As these correspondences were opposed to the way in which Jesus conjoined Himself with the Baptist in iii. 11, that expression about ascending into heaven is connected with a well-known proverbial expression from the Old Testament (Deut. xxx. 12; *Prov.* xxx. 4; Baruch iii. 29; comp. Rom. x. 6), which had nothing to do with Christ's heavenly origin. His unique knowledge of divine decrees is here expressly led back to His call, so unique of its kind, when, exactly as in the older tradition, Jesus is announced by the name of Son of man. In the same way also He does not once call Himself directly Son *of man*; but He speaks of what He alone could perform in a connection which required its application to Himself (*vide* chap. v.).

not stretch forth His miraculous arm to glorify His Messiah before all people when now at the commencement of His career? In regard to this, there was disclosed to Jesus one of those heavenly secrets which were only known to Him who had penetrated God's decree down into its hidden depths. Even the Baptist believed that the Messianic age would commence with the judgment, which was to be followed by the establishment of the perfected kingdom of God with those of the nation who stood the test as subjects; this expectation doubtless pervaded the entire nation. For this to be realized, the Messiah must truly be lifted up before all the people to whom in His perfect glory He was to be made known as Judge. Jesus was aware that in the counsel of eternal Love it had been otherwise determined. If the judgment were to begin now, the whole nation was lost. Who could stand before the eyes of the only righteous One? But He had not come to judge, but to save; He would point out the way of salvation to the lost children of His people, that all might participate in the impending salvation. The Father had sent His only Son, His Well-Beloved, that through Him the whole nation might be made aware of His inscrutable love (iii. 16 f.). At a later date, Jesus announced this secret of the kingdom of God in parables which indicated that the judgment was delayed until the consummation of the Messiah's work (Matt. xiii. 24–30, 47 f.), and He declared, without either figure or comparison, that He was come to seek and to save that which was lost (Luke xix. 10). But so much the more did salvation depend on the believing acceptation of His Person and work, even where this most rudely contradicted all hereditary conceptions and expectations. Whoever refused such faith had himself to blame if he were excluded from the salvation brought by Christ, and fell a victim to the judgment (John iii. 18).[1]

[1] Partly in the words of the Prologue, and partly in a genuinely Johannine way, there is attached to this a reflection of the evangelist's own as to how the self-judgment of unbelief, threatened by Jesus (iii. 18), was actually accomplished throughout the entire later history of His ministry (iii. 19–21). The hand of the evangelist is apparent before this, not indeed in the name of the only-begotten Son, which is here employed in no metaphysical sense, but in the whole dogmatic formulating of the revelation of God's love, which was consummated in the appearance of Christ, and of its relation to the world lying in

It is quite after the manner of the Fourth Gospel to say nothing about the result of this conversation. What the narrator was concerned with was its tenor, not the narrative connected with it. The continuation will show us, however, that this nocturnal talk was not lost on Nicodemus. For Jesus, too, it was not without significance. It only brought to a close the experience gained from His entire ministry at the feast. The nation, and in particular the populace of the capital and the southern province, was not yet ripe for His true Messianic ministry. The Baptist had still to complete his work. Jesus must therefore prepare His own way. He saw in these experiences a sign from God that He should withdraw to a more preparative ministry. What other form could such an activity assume but that which had been pointed out to His prophetic forerunner by God Himself? Did Jesus, perhaps, choose this form, expressly sanctioned by the heads of the people, that He might be secure from any interruption of His ministry by those who already were suspiciously inclined? It was apparently on the conclusion of the feast that He betook Himself to the country of Judea, and began to summon the people to the baptism of repentance, just as the Baptist had done (John iii. 22). It is true, He could not Himself baptize (iv. 2) without appearing to renounce the claim of being that mighty One whom the Baptist had proclaimed; but even John had associated disciples with himself for the purpose of performing the rite, and Jesus, who was already accompanied by His disciple John,

sin, which is expressed by a phrase peculiar to the doctrinal language of the apostle; so too in the view of the completion of salvation being the eternal life, which the believer in his own faith possesses here and now. Above all, however, the evangelist, as he afterwards himself said, saw in this metaphor of the exaltation impending before Jesus (iii. 14) a mysterious hint (xii. 32 f.) as to the way in which Jesus was actually to attain this elevation. By elevating Him on the cross, His enemies themselves were compelled to aid in the exaltation (comp. viii. 28), which became His on His resurrection and His returning to His Father. It was to this elevation he referred those words of Jesus, although the brazen serpent, which in the older narrative was assuredly not represented as being the mediator of salvation, had no analogy with the Redeemer dying on the cross; nor did Jesus' present situation offer any point of contact for regarding His death as the means to the eventual exaltation of which Jesus here speaks as of a self-evident matter, only that He may thus preface the statement that this redemptive death is also a reason for simple faith, when there is any desire to obtain salvation (iii. 15).

may very probably have found many among the followers who gathered about Him at the feast (ii. 17) who were ready to support Him. From the complete silence with which the evangelist has enveloped this baptismal ministry of more than seven months' duration, it is perfectly vain to indulge in subtle inquiries as to how Jesus employed it as a preparation for His Messianic ministry proper. In any case, however, the idea is perfectly untenable that He somehow put another significance into the rite introduced by the Baptist, which made it baptism in the specific Christian sense. The evangelist expressly indicates that Jesus' baptism was regarded as standing on the same platform with the Johannine (iii. 26, iv. 1). There is not the slightest probability that Jesus' baptism referred to Him who had come, as John's had pointed to the One who was to come; for even in the real Messianic ministry this was done only indirectly. Besides this, His preaching of repentance had another background, and was therefore obliged to assume a different character from the Johannine, for we learn from the conversation with Nicodemus how greatly Jesus' view of the coming future differed from John's.[1]

Where Jesus laboured we know not; but He would probably seek out a suitable spot in the Jordan valley. His path did not cross the Baptist's. We have seen before that the latter could not cease baptizing, although he knew that Jesus had been anointed Messiah by God, so long as He did not openly appear and begin the establishment of the kingdom. He had already, however, left his station at the south end of the Jordan. Was it perhaps in consequence of that

[1] If there is a convincing proof of the historicity of these reminiscences lying at the foundation of the Fourth Gospel, it is this narrative of the return of Jesus for a time to the activity of the Baptist. Indeed, the more elevated did his conception of Jesus' Person become, the less likely was it that immediately after the solemn opening of His public ministry the evangelist should think of placing Him in this respect on an equality with His forerunner. This has been acknowledged even by Renan, who regards it as the seizure of a method of winning the multitude that had been devised and proved by the Baptist. We have demonstrated above that the evangelist had no intention of describing the institution of Christian baptism; and to relieve the Baptist completely and formally, or to give him an opportunity of fixing his relation to Christ, which in i. 26 f., 30–34, he has already characterized clearly, this invention was surely unnecessary, while it was contrary to all the presuppositions of the Baptist. And yet it has been held that John iv. 2 is really an imitation of 1 Cor. i. 17!

deputation from the Sanhedrim? Although the Council had at the time found no reason for interfering, the Baptist may have apprehended, nevertheless, frequent collisions that might be injurious to his activity. Or was his scheme so arranged from the first, that after he had laboured for such a length of time in the south, he should approach the populace of the northern province?[1] The baptismal movement had now two centres, and must have been greatly strengthened thereby. Indeed, it speedily became apparent that not John's centre, but the place where Jesus baptized, was the more eagerly sought after (iii. 26). In the degree in which Jesus' ministry was here removed from the immediate control of the hierarchy could the country population of Judea, nay, even that of the principal towns, acquire the ingenuousness and joyousness requisite for yielding themselves to its influence. Tidings of all this reached the circle surrounding the Baptist. The evangelist John has preserved the reminiscence of how a Jew appeared at the place where John was baptizing, and communicated the intelligence. There was something genuinely human in the Baptist's disciples being painfully moved by the tidings, especially as a dispute arose as to which baptism was the higher and more effectual; and so too was the complaint addressed to their master, that the successor, whom He had first introduced to the people, was now drawing all the people to Himself (iii. 25 f.).[2]

The Baptist drew the attention of his zealous disciples to the fact that his success was as much a divine gift as that of his great successor. He pointed out that he had declared himself to be nothing else than the forerunner of the Messiah, of whose greater success he could not therefore be jealous (iii. 27 f.). He then connected this with a common repre-

[1] Ænon, near to Salim, mentioned in John iii. 23 as where He baptized, is quite unknown to us; but statements of the Church Fathers point to its being in the far north. The usual impression that John was also labouring in Judea is most improbable, judging from the indications given in this evangelist; it is perfectly impossible that he can have taken up his station in Samaria; there is therefore nothing left but the Galilean and Perean districts. Besides, the remark as to the abundance of water at the spot does not preclude the possibility of its being in the Jordan valley, for the Jordan could scarcely be of sufficient depth at every part for baptismal purposes.

[2] It is precisely the more perspicuous manner of our evangelist which shuts out any idea of the invention of this scene, in which Strauss would see a third trans-

sentation in the Old Testament, according to which the relation between Jehovah and His people is presented as a conjugal one (Isa. liv. 5; Hos. ii. 18 f.). Following up this idea, the Messiah was the bridegroom; he, His forerunner, the friend who wooed the bride for the bridegroom. But as the friend of the bridegroom rejoiced without envy over the jubilation of him who had won his bride, so could he also rejoice at the flocking of the multitude to Jesus, in which he saw the near dawning of the Messianic age, when the perfect union of the Messiah with His people would be consummated (John iii. 29). It is involved in his connection with the bridegroom that the part of "*Schoschben*," *i.e.* match-maker, ceases in proportion as the happy day approaches. The one must increase, but he must decrease (iii. 30). It is true that Strauss regards such a humble retiring of the predecessor before his great follower as psychologically inconceivable. But whoever sees in him a prophet sent by God, and possessed by an intense consciousness of the divine decree regarding his calling, will find nothing impossible in this ungrudging renunciation. Did he really know that this last and greatest Messenger from God stood high above all those who had been favoured with a word of divine revelation to proclaim on earth (iii. 31), because He possessed the Spirit without measure, and therefore that that which He uttered was the word of God? was he aware that to Jesus, as the chosen object of divine love, the execution of all the divine decrees had been entrusted? (iii. 34 f.). If this were so, then in conclusion he could only warn the jealous disciples, who so completely mistook the majesty of Jesus, that whoever obeyed Him not, could not be saved from the approaching wrath of God (iii. 36).[1]

formation and reapplication of the synoptic message from the Baptist. To speak of the dispute more particularly is not the evangelist's intention. It was sufficient that it was the cause of a fresh testimony to Jesus from the Baptist (iii. 27–36). How the evangelist became aware of these words of the Baptist we know not. Was it perhaps owing to them that Andrew broke off his relations with the old master in order to be serviceable to the new one, and so brought the intelligence to the circle surrounding Jesus? At all events, the evangelist was not himself an ear-witness of these words,—a fact which explains why they are given in Johannine language to a greater extent than usual, without the elucidations of the evangelist regarding isolated points having any connection with the original words (as iii. 19–21 with iii. 18).

[1] It is evident that here also the evangelist has introduced into a statement

The last word we hear from the Baptist is a reminder of the divine judgment with which his proclamation started (comp. Matt. iii. 7). He perhaps felt how near the catastrophe was which should prepare such a melancholy termination for his ministry. Jesus' work of baptism, too, was coming to a close, for He had learnt how not only the Baptist and his disciples, but also the Pharisees, had had their attention drawn to His increasing influence (iv. 1).[1] There is, indeed, not a single word in this source to indicate that He was now threatened with persecutions from the Pharisees, or was apprehensive of anything of the kind; they were still without any ground upon which to proceed. It is historically true, however, that the party which hitherto had wielded most control over the nation, was the first to give jealous attention to Him who gained a constantly increasing influence over the people (comp. vol. i. p. 356 f.). It was evident to Jesus that conflicts with this party must ultimately be the result of this; it is true He might not evade them in the future, but He was obliged to avoid them in this His preparative ministry, in order not to prepare unpleasant difficulties for His subsequent Messianic labours. He saw in it a sign from God that the close of this seven months' time of waiting, which He had undoubtedly persevered in with not a

by the Baptist regarding Jesus' unique dignity, which corresponded with His peculiar equipment for His calling, his own profounder knowledge of Christ's heavenly origin, so that the revelation brought by Christ appears to lead back partially to the immediate knowledge He brought from heaven with Him (iii. 31 f.), and partially, which alone answers to the Baptist's standpoint, to the equipment by the Spirit at baptism (i. 32). Thus there emerges here again in iii. 32 the reflection of the Prologue, which is scarcely compatible with ver 26, and which in other ways reminds one of the specific Johannine language. Compare ver. 27 with xix. 11; the close of ver. 29 with 1 John i. 4; ver. 33 with 1 John v. 10; ver. 35 with xiii. 3, and ver. 36 with 1 John v. 12 f. Yet the remark about the bridegroom must not be taken for an echo of Mark ii. 19 f., where the same figure certainly occurs, for it is employed in a totally different way. But since, notwithstanding all this, other conceptions are visible, as well as expressions totally foreign to the evangelist, this clearly shows that reminiscences of genuine words of the Baptist are here repeated, but only in a free Johannine way.

[1] It is in no way indicated that Jesus had here gathered a congregation around Him; that is contradicted by everything we hear as to His baptismal ministry in Judea. But all those who went out to Jesus instead of to John, that they might receive baptism at the hands of His scholars, were regarded as being His followers.

little self-denial, had now come. He had more than amply fulfilled His duty towards this portion of the land, to which He had been directed in the first place by the divine dispensation that had once decreed the centre of national life should be there. There was no longer any hindrance to His returning to His home; to it He could now devote Himself entirely, and there, free from the ban of the hierarchy, He might hope at last to commence His true Messianic ministry.

Thus Jesus departed for Galilee (John iv. 3). His followers, who had supported Him in His baptismal ministry, and were probably Galileans, accompanied Him on the journey (iv. 8). The evangelist remarks expressly that it was not His choice to pass through Samaria, but this way presented itself as the natural and necessary one (iv. 4). The amazing success He met with there was not sought for by Him; it was granted by His Father.

## CHAPTER III.

### BESIDE JACOB'S WELL.

BETWEEN Judea and the northern province of Galilee lay the district of Samaria. Since the time of Herod the Great it had been a province of the Jewish kingdom, and after the deposition of Archelaus, had passed, along with Judea, under a Roman procurator; a deep-rooted hereditary enmity separated the Jews from the Samaritans, who were looked upon as being half Gentiles (comp. Matt. x. 5). Their descent was in truth of a dubious character. After the downfall of the northern kingdom, and the carrying away of the ten tribes, Shalmaneser peopled the wasted districts with heathen colonists from various provinces of his dominion, among the most important of whom were the Samaritans, who still liked to be called Cuthites. The Old Testament contains an enumeration of the national gods those strangers brought with them (2 Kings xvii. 29 ff.). It was not long, however, before they intermingled with the remnant of the Israelitish population, and accepted the worship of Jehovah. The inhabitants of Samaria always regarded themselves as being Israelites, and asserted that they belonged to the house of Joseph. After the return of the two southern tribes from exile, they craved admission to the new central service which was to be instituted; but the antipathy to everything Gentile, which the young colony had brought with it, was transferred to this populace of impure blood and doubtful orthodoxy, and the Samaritan claim was disallowed by Zerubbabel and Jeshua. From that time they hindered, so far as it lay in their power, the building of the temple and the walls of Jerusalem, and the bitterness so induced ultimately led to open schism. A temple to Jehovah was erected upon the hill Gerizim, lying to the south of the town Sichem; and even when, after an existence of two hundred years, this building was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, the hill

still continued to be their sacred place of worship. During the Seleucide and Roman dominion, they were unfailingly on the side of the enemies of Judea, although in the Jews' last struggle for freedom they had taken no part.

In the time of Jesus they were looked upon as the hereditary enemies of the nation (comp. John viii. 48). Each people overwhelmed the other with words of abuse and contempt; and when pilgrims to the feasts passed through Samaria, scoffing was never lacking, nor, indeed, did malicious deeds of violence fail. There was a preference for avoiding them entirely (John iv. 9); but although any intercourse was interdicted by the later rabbinical tradition, according to which neither bread nor wine might be accepted from a Samaritan, yet the road for pilgrims still lay through Samaria (comp. iv. 8). This people was, nevertheless, of the same faith with Israel. They worshipped the one God of the fathers, yea, they carefully avoided all anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions, and permitted no image of Jehovah to exist. Of the sacred documents of the Jews, they recognised the Pentateuch only, and so far as their exclusion from the national sanctuary permitted, they kept strictly to its statutes. They rejected, however, not the collective Pharisaic tradition alone, but also the whole prophetical development of Mosaism. The popular Jewish expectation of the Messiah was foreign to them, for the politico-national element in it could not but find them unsympathetic, since they were excluded from the "kingdom." But they too hoped for the Messiah; only on the ground of a passage from the Thora (Deut. xviii. 15), they thought of Him more as an ethical religious reformer than a mighty converter or restorer. The ancient and sacred recollections of the people were nurtured with enthusiasm. In the neighbourhood of the town Sichem the patriarch Jacob had once upon a time purchased a field (Gen. xxxiii. 19), where it was commanded that Joseph's bones should be buried (Josh. xxiv. 32). At another spot was a well which, according to Samaritan tradition, had been dug by the patriarch himself, and which is still shown to the south-east of Nablûs (the ancient Sichem) at the foot of the hill Gerizim.[1]

[1] The Sychar mentioned in John iv. 5 is usually regarded as being the ancient Sichem, and it is assumed that the name of the Samaritan town was turned into

Tired with His journey, Jesus rested at mid-day beside Jacob's well. From the little town lying at no great distance, a Samaritan woman came to the well to draw water. The fact of her coming at mid-day has been thought surprising, for it is customary to carry water in the cool of the evening; but it only explains that she was alone, while we know from well-known scenes by the fountains in the Old Testament, how such a well was besieged by water-carriers at the evening hour. Jesus seized the opportunity as she reached down with her draw-vessel in order to fill the pitcher, and asked her for a drink of water. There is no ground for supposing that He purposed to enter upon a profounder conversation with her, for the evangelist expressly makes the reason of the request to be the fact of Jesus having no one who could draw water for Him. It was the woman who first banteringly expressed her astonishment that He, a Jew, should condescend to ask anything from a Samaritan woman. She knew well how haughtily the Jew generally looked down upon the Samaritan, and it was a certain satisfaction to her that thirst should force Him to overcome Himself so far as to determine upon addressing a request to an alien (John iv. 6–9).

That Jesus did not intend to pursue His ministry in Samaria is shown by His resting by the well, and only sending some of His disciples into the town to buy food. But in the way in which the woman entered into conversation with Him He saw a sign from God bidding Him not let the opportunity pass without improving it; and therefore, forgetting His own necessity, He directed the conversation to the highest object

a sobriquet in the popular Jewish parlance, meaning the town of drunkards or liars. But the way in which the evangelist introduces the name of the place as one which was little known, tells against this supposition; and Sichem, separated as it was by Gerizim, lay at too great a distance from Jacob's well for water to be brought from it, especially as in its own immediate neighbourhood there were many fountains. Some little town lying near Jacob's well is certainly intended, and this, it is supposed, has been discovered in the El Askar of the present day near Nablûs. In any case, this was the town to which Jesus sent His disciples to buy food (John iv. 8). But since this fact is only communicated in order to explain how it happened that Jesus, although suffering from thirst, could not refresh Himself from the well, because His disciples had carried with them the indispensable utensils for drawing water, yet it is not necessarily implied that He was quite alone. The vivid fulness with which the evangelist narrates the following scene, gives some ground for the supposition that John at least had not left His Master's side.

of His calling. Was she amazed that He should ask a drink from her, it was her lack of acquaintance with His person that the opposite was not the case; for if she knew the gift of God, which He who was still unknown to her had to offer, she would have asked Him for living water. In a figure of speech, suggested by the situation, He described the blessed message He had to bring as "refreshing water." The woman, who, of course, can have had no idea that the strange Jew spoke of spiritual things, thought of real spring water; and she was reasonably surprised at His speech, for He could draw no water from the deep well without draw-vessels. But is it other water which He has to offer her? then she does not understand why that should be better than what she can here draw for herself; for this is consecrated by memories of the patriarchs, and had sufficed for the ancient father, for his household, and his cattle. Jesus certainly did not expect the woman to understand Him; but it was this very contradiction, so ingenuously grasped by the woman, and which was presented by the literal meaning of the words, that He intended should lead her to a presentiment of their higher meaning; it was the enigma proposed by His words which was first to attract and then fix her attention. Jesus therefore seized on her answer in order to bring home to her that His remark must be taken in a figurative sense. The water He offers her is undoubtedly of better quality than that from the patriarch's well; thirst is quenched temporarily by the one, but permanently by the other, for to him who has once partaken it flows continually. Indeed, its efficacy is so wonderful that its assuaging power extends even into the world to come. But even this explanation suggested nothing to the woman but the idea of a miraculous water which would once for all do away with the necessity of her laborious journey to the well; and when she asks for this water, the way in which she holds forth the expectation aroused by His words, shows a slight doubt as to the possibility of such a gift (iv. 10–15).[1]

[1] It has been alleged, indeed, that again we have what is nothing but a profoundly metaphorical speech of Jesus, the misapprehension of which presented an opportunity for carrying it out yet further, for it is quite after the manner of the Johannine conversations. Undoubtedly, however, there would be no more

It certainly does not seem as if the woman was acquiring a clearer understanding of Jesus' words, or of the significance of His person. She had no feeling of spiritual need, and therefore what Jesus said regarding spiritual things touched no kindred chord within her, and did not rouse her understanding. There was only one way by which to awaken that want, and that was to excite a sense of guilt. Jesus was obliged to turn her glance to her own past, to point her to the grievous stain on her life. But was He then acquainted with her past life? It is nonsense to speak of His having read it in her heart, or upon her countenance; a series of facts and their last result cannot be gleaned from the changing impressions they have left behind. The conjecture of a happy chance having supplied Him with knowledge of her circumstances compromises, as in the talk with Nathanael, the integrity of Jesus, who thereby permits Himself to be looked on falsely as a prophet. But if the woman was sent to Him by God, that He might gain her for the knowledge which brings salvation, the means necessary for this end were granted Him; and at once the past and present of this woman stood disclosed before Him as before the eyes of one who can look into hidden things. Call thy husband and come hither, says Jesus. He seems to desire that the conversation be cut short, and yet really wishes to give it the direction which could alone make it fruitful. These words were to remind the woman that she was living in sin and shame, but she tried to avoid an open confession of the fact by the half-honest subterfuge, "I have no husband." Jesus, however, taking her at her word, tells her plainly that the man with whom she is now living, after having been married five times, is not her husband, but only her paramour. Undoubtedly then He was acquainted with her whole life (comp. iv. 29). We do not know why the story of her five marriages in particular should

convincing proof of the invention of this colloquy than if the woman had understood the assertion about the living water, and had entered into Jesus' meaning. On the contrary, there is something true to nature about the *naïveté* with which she endeavoured to adapt His words according to their apparent significance, and the involuntary reverence extorted from her by the impression made by Jesus,—a reverence at first startled when He appeared to place Himself above the patriarchs, but which then, with the felicitous confidence of a superstitious age, credited Him with a miraculous power that shrank from no test.

have burnt in upon her conscience; but she knew that all the circumstances were within His ken. She did not dare to deny the imputation, and made no attempt to excuse herself, but was forced to acknowledge openly that He was right. "Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet." Surely, then, it is not a feminine artfulness alone desirous of passing from the painful discussion of her circumstances that leads her to give the discourse a new turn; as yet there is certainly no felt personal need of salvation which would lead her to ask where she shall seek peace for her soul, for when such a want is once truly aroused it is immediately met. Jesus, however, had attained His purpose of directing her thoughts to religious things. We see by this time that this light woman, with a life of sinful levity behind her, is not without religious interests. In the great question, dividing the Jews from the Samaritans, as to whether people should worship on Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem, she had a national interest, an interest that could be roused even when she was certain a prophet was before her (John iv. 16–20).

Jesus now stood, for the first time, at the height of His Messianic ministry. He could look into the future He was to bring to pass, when neither upon that mountain, whose somewhat flattened cone rose desolate in front of the speakers, nor in Jerusalem and its temple-courts should worship be offered; to the time when the kingdom of God having come, its subjects should look up to their Father in heaven as He had ever done, and a special locality for worship would be required no longer. This is not to say, however, that the question in dispute, separating the two people, was indifferent for the time. Indeed, it arose from the fact of the Samaritans having cut themselves off from the course of the divine history of revelation which entailed the erection of the temple in Jerusalem. Both nations worshipped the same God, but the Jews apprehended Him as He had revealed Himself through the long series of prophets, because from them the great Messianic salvation was to come; the Samaritans, who had arbitrarily closed the canon with the Pentateuch, did not know Him, for there is no true knowledge of God apart from the perception of God in His revelation. In the prophetical revelations God prepared for the salvation

that was to come from the Jews, and these were not recognised by the Samaritans. In this way Jesus examined the difference dividing the two peoples in the present from the standpoint of the future to which He referred. And that future was already present, for He now began to proclaim it, and so to bring about the time when the confederates of the kingdom should worship the Father in spirit and truth. Whether they still continue to worship upon Gerizim or in Jerusalem,—and in this case, where Jesus speaks of the present, both forms are *not* excluded,—the principal point is that they worship Him spiritually and genuinely, *i.e.* in a way corresponding with God's perfected revelation. Jesus does not proclaim a new spiritual religion, nor does He put forward a new conception of God; that God is Spirit, both the Jews and Samaritans know equally well, indeed the latter were particularly fond of giving this truth unequivocal expression. Jesus rather appeals to this acknowledgment of theirs as the presupposition of what He is about to say. For if God is made manifest through Him as the Father of the subjects of that realm, they must necessarily be required to worship Him in a truly spiritual way, answering to His spiritual nature, and proceeding upon His perfected revelation to call upon Him as a Father. When that took place the future would then have arrived when the obligation to worship at any spot in particular would cease, and when Jews and Samaritans would become the children of one Father (John iv. 21–24).

It is possible that, as regards expression, much has here been formed in a Johannine style, but through the vesture of phraseology the mighty ground-ideas of these words shine unmistakeably. Unable to grasp them entirely, and yet suspecting that the Jew alluded to the great Messianic future, the woman comforted herself with the coming of the Messiah, who would explain all this. We shall see, indeed, how afterward in Galilee Jesus kept back cautiously from the direct confession of His Messiahship. In this case all these suppositions were lacking which made circumspection necessary there, for the Messianic hope of the Samaritans, as we saw from the words used by the woman, had no connection whatever with the national and political element. In this one

soul a longing was awakened for the highest revelations which the Messiah was to bring, and this desire answers for her readiness to believe. On this account Jesus no longer put a restraint upon Himself, but acknowledged openly that He was the Messiah (John iv. 25 f.).[1]

In the meantime the disciples returned from the city, and were surprised to find their Master talking with a woman, for the Rabbis at that date considered it beneath their dignity to do such a thing. But awe of Him prevented them from asking what He wanted from her, or why He spoke with her at all. Besides, their arrival interrupted the conversation. The woman left her water-pot, and hastened to the city to announce the great discovery to her town's-people, and to call upon them to seek with her the prophet whom she ventured, but doubtfully, to describe as the Messiah. When the disciples now invited Jesus to partake of the food they had brought with them, He could not refrain from speaking of what had moved Him so profoundly. Temporal wants had long been forgotten in the joy of having once been able to speak of the sublimest things that He was to communicate. Naturally enough, the disciples could not understand why it was He refused the food, for no one could be seen who had given Him to eat. But for Him there existed meat which they could not

[1] The imitation of the fountain scenes in the Old Testament is too poor a motive for regarding this narrative as a fiction. It was not until Hengstenberg discovered that the woman was a representative of the Samaritan people, her five husbands the gods they once had worshipped, and her present husband Jehovah, to whom she was not yet properly married, that criticism drew the manifest conclusion that the whole story must of necessity be an allegory. 2 Kings xvii. 30 ff. names not five, but seven gods, whom this allegory makes lovers along with Jehovah; and in John's narrative at least, the Israelitish descent of the Samaritans is undoubtedly presupposed (comp. iv. 12), who, therefore, before they mingled with heathens and idolatrous concerns, had had Jehovah as their husband, and, moreover, iv. 29 does not treat the woman's past as an allegory of well-known historical facts; but all this does not disturb the bold flight of such fantastical exegesis. If Christianity in the person of Jesus was to be represented as overcoming the Samaritan and Jewish religions, there would have been something said of the woman's worship, and of the equally deficient worship of the Jews, while really from the way in which the Samaritans themselves take up the woman's position, and the representative of Christianity identifies Himself with the Jews and their knowledge of God, that explanation is removed, the reference to the coming of salvation from the Jews making it impossible to comprehend Jews and Gentiles in the "you" which is opposed to the "we" (iv. 22).

comprehend, and a satisfying that enabled Him to do without natural food. What gives Him the greatest inward contentment and satisfaction, what is more to Him than the daily bread of temporal life, is the fulfilling of His calling; He has dealt with a human soul as God desired He should, and He has now effected the work He was sent to do (John iv. 27–34).[1]

While He was yet speaking, Jesus saw the town's-folk coming through the fields, which to the disciples were only green corn-fields, requiring yet four months to elapse before being completely ripe.[2] He bade them raise their eyes, however, and see how the fields are already white and ripe for the harvest. Such a ripe harvest-field His prophetical glance sees in the Samaritans who approach through the corn. He knows assuredly that they will be ready to believe as the woman was whose call they follow; for not in vain had she been brought to Him by the Father that He might scatter seed in her heart, the fruit of which shall be gathered in the barns of the approaching future. Certainly this fairest reward of the sower's work will only be enjoyed by the reaper who bears it into the kingdom of God which is to be established; but it is the task of the reaper to prepare for him the joy of seeing

[1] This also has been objected to as a misconception on the part of the disciples, although it is difficult to understand how they could arrive at the idea that Jesus spoke of a higher kind of satisfying. But although the evangelist only passes by this to the glorious words which give us the profoundest insight into Jesus' soul, and which led to John's introducing the narrative at all, this does not mean that he communicated everything that passed between Jesus and His disciples. If He said this to them, He would also tell what had caused Him to forget temporal wants; and however close at hand we may regard Sychar as being, more time must have elapsed than was necessary for speaking the few words related here before the citizens were seen approaching along with the woman, and yet we know that the discourse lasted until they came in sight.

[2] This passage shows indisputably that December had begun when Jesus passed through Samaria, so that He must have spent more than seven months in Judea. Four months later—that is, in April—was the commencement of harvest, and since the feast of Passover (also in April) Jesus had been in Judea. Now, as the sowing began in the beginning of November, Jesus may easily have been surrounded by green fields a month later. All attempts to refer the words to some other situation than the actual one by taking them in a proverbial sense, so that they lose their chronological signification, are frustrated by the purport of the words, as also by the fact that from seed-time until harvest is a period of more than four months.

the work he began brought to completion. There is nothing assumed in all this but the truth of the saying, "one soweth and another reapeth" (John iv. 35–37). It had been decided in the counsel of God that this should hold good in the present case. It was as the Messiah of Israel that Jesus came to His people, and they could only receive the full blessing of His ministry by being prepared for it historically (Matt. xv. 24). Not till the kingdom of God was established in Israel should the promise of the prophets be fulfilled regarding the nations who should come from all the ends of the earth to demand a share in the blessing (Mic. iv. 1 ff.; Isa. ii. 2 ff.; cf. Luke ii. 31 f.). For this reason He had to keep the rich harvest in the Samaritan field for His disciples. To His prophetical eye, however, sowing and harvest confronted each other; and He therefore rejoiced in that future harvest at the sight of the approaching Samaritans.[1]

At the request of the inhabitants of the town Jesus remained with them for two days, establishing faith in His Messianic calling by His word, which among them did not need the aid of signs and wonders. But longer He might not tarry. His steps were directed to the home where a long and laborious task awaited Him, not an easy success as He had with the Samaritans, ready as they were to believe (John iv. 39–44). Difficulty has been found in understanding how the evangelist could explain this resolution of Jesus by words which He used at a later date in regard to His home (Mark vi. 4): "A prophet hath no honour in his own country." And yet he only interprets this saying in accordance with what Jesus had Himself just said figuratively about His action (iv. 37 f.). It was not the quitting of Judea, but of Samaria, that was in question; not what He *will* do to facilitate His task, but what, according to the counsel of God, He *must* do to accomplish the work His Father has laid on Him. The fair harvest labour in Samaria He leaves for His disciples, while He selects for Himself the laborious task of being the sower in

[1] There is no necessity for the interpretation which, from his standpoint, the evangelist adds in iv. 38. The sending forth of the disciples had not yet taken place, and their work as sowers had scarcely begun. At an after period Jesus looked on His work under the figure of sowing seed, and described His disciples as those who should gather the harvest in (Matt. ix. 37 f.).

His native place, where, in the nature of things, He could look for no such readiness to believe as He had found to such a surprising extent in Samaria.

It was certainly of set purpose that the evangelist, who passes by the laborious time in Galilee almost silently, and who only depicts *one* distinctive picture out of Jesus' Judean ministry, should sketch so vividly and lovingly these sunny days in Samaria, which only formed a transient episode in Jesus' history. It may be that he regarded the Samaritans, who believed at the mere word of Jesus, as forming a strong contrast to Nicodemus, who only believed, and that not in the right way, because of Jesus' miracles. But surely the narrative is not on this account a free composition.[1] It is true, indeed, that Jesus thought better of the Samaritans than His countrymen did, a fact which presupposes some connection with them, some kind of personal experience. It is all very well to point out how the aim of the parable of the man who fell among thieves required that a stranger should be placed in opposition to the Jewish priest and the Levite; but the very fact of Jesus selecting a Samaritan shows that He relied upon them more than his compatriots were in the habit of doing. In the narrative of the grateful Samaritan, also, who distinguished himself beyond the nine lepers who were healed (Luke xvii. 16), we see a fresh proof of Samaritan receptivity, which is not destroyed by the fact of Jesus at one time experiencing their inhospitality, especially as that did not apply to the Messiah, but to the pilgrim to the feast (Luke ix. 53). It is the case, besides, that the gospel afterwards found among the Samaritans a strangely rapid and joyous acceptance (Acts viii.), which, to the historical view, presupposes some prepara-

[1] Little as the Samaritan woman is a mere allegory of her people, she is equally far from being the type of believing heathendom in contrast to the unbelieving Judaism represented in Nicodemus, as Baur has interpreted the story. A woman who calls Jacob her father (iv. 12), who places her divine worship on a level with the Jewish (ver. 20), and hopes for the Messiah (ver. 25), is no type of heathendom. So, too, the conversion of her country people cannot represent the great conquest of the world by Christianity, nor iv. 38 refer to the first apostles, the result of whose labours was reaped by the great converter of the Gentiles. It is, however, to transpose all the historical circumstances to regard this as a kind of prophetical picture of the conversion of Samaria as related in Acts viii., as has been done even by those who assume the historicity of the narrative.

tion of the ground, some probability that Jesus' ministry had not left this province wholly untouched. Our narrative solves this enigma, like so many others which would have been inexplicable to us without John's Gospel. It relates how the Father permitted the Son to find here an unsought-for field of labour, more hopeful than any in Israel; it shows us how He scattered the seed in Samaria that was one day to shoot up into maturity.

# CHAPTER IV.

## THE RETURN TO GALILEE.

WHEN Jesus returned to His native country, He turned first of all to Cana, seeking there His family circle (comp. vol. i. p. 378). He was soon to learn in what sense He had meantime become a celebrated man. The talk on every hand was not of His having denounced the desecration of the sanctuary, nor of what He had generally preached during the feast, but of the deeds of healing He had performed in Jerusalem. When He returned to the bosom of His family, the partisans who had rallied round Him in Judea and accompanied Him on the journey separated themselves from Him and went to their own homes, helping thereby to spread the report through the province that the great countryman was again there who had wrought such mighty works in Jerusalem. This intelligence found its way to Capernaum in particular, to which John and Andrew had returned. And so it happened that even a royal official, whose son lay at the point of death, set out on the endeavour to obtain help from this great performer of miracles (John iv. 45–47).

The healing of this son is expressly described by John as the first miracle done by Jesus after His return to Galilee (iv. 54), from which we understand that the remembrance of the event had stamped itself on tradition with peculiar force. Even the oldest of the apostolic sources narrates it as among the first of Jesus' miracles of healing (comp. Matt. viii. 5–13); but the story was read by Luke not there alone, but also in the sources peculiar to himself, and we learn from both quarters that the father who asked succour for his sick boy was a military officer of high rank, and indeed was the captain of a centurio, the permanent garrison in Capernaum.[1]

[1] The fact of Luke's having seen the narrative in the apostolic source is apparent from his putting it in the same connection as the first evangelist,

Herod Antipas had confessedly organized his military forces on the Roman model, and kept Roman officers in his pay. This man was one of those, and was therefore a true-born Gentile; and it was no doubt the meeting of such a man and Jesus which led tradition to tarry over it with such particular interest. According to the source peculiar to Luke, it appears as if the Gentile did not venture personally to present his request to the Israelitish worker of miracles, but employed in some way the mediation of the Jewish elders, probably of the chief men of the synagogue. These were obliged to commend him to Jesus as a friend of his nation, a title which the centurion merited by having erected or re-erected the synagogue at Capernaum (vii. 3–5).[1] It has accordingly been supposed, and perhaps not without reason, that the centurion, although uncircumcised, was one of those proselytes of the gate who, without subjecting themselves to the law of Moses, worshipped the God of Israel.

and from both forms coinciding literally in the second part (Luke vii. 6–10), while in the first Luke's version shows strange variations. His first idea was of a bond-servant, and then naturally of one held in special esteem by the centurion (vii. 2), although ver. 7 shows that he was acquainted with the expression which the first evangelist had met with in the apostolic source. This is in itself indeed ambiguous; but as Matt. viii. 9 uses another expression by which to describe the servant, the word here, as in another narrative of the same source (Matt. xvii. 18), must necessarily be understood as meaning his son. In regard to the illness, we know only that it was deadly (John iv. 47–49; Luke vii. 2), and was accompanied with high fever (John iv. 52). In the apostolic source the principal stress seems to have been laid upon the frightful sufferings of the sick one; for when the first evangelist describes the sickness as a palsy (paralysis), which is not necessarily accompanied by great pain, it is more as an explanation why the father did not bring the invalid himself to Jesus, as happened on other occasions, particularly as he so strongly emphasizes the fact of his son being sick in bed (Matt. viii. 6).

[1] This touch, which might easily be inserted in the oldest tradition if the elders accompanied the centurion or prepared the way for his personal appearance, must have been taken from a particular source. A mere recommendation of the Gentile, such as Strauss supposed, could have been mentioned by the Gentile-Christian author even without this mediation; and if this trait is carried back to the knowledge of the narrator that Jesus as yet had had no personal intercourse with Gentiles, this mediation does not remove the far more important fact that Jesus permitted one uncircumcised to partake of the benefits of His miraculous power. In this trait, however, there is no real enhancing of the man's humility, and nothing of the kind can be intended, for the real point of the narrative, even in Luke, does not consist in that, but in the centurion's faith.

According to its sketchy manner, the oldest narrative does not seize on these details, but on a remarkable utterance by the centurion. When Jesus declared Himself willing to come and heal the boy, the petitioner was overcome by the feeling that he, a Gentile, was too unworthy for the great worker of miracles to enter beneath his roof. Neither was it necessary, for let Him only speak the word and the boy would recover. The father then proceeded with the utmost simplicity to prove this from the experiences of his daily life. He also is under authority, and knows what it is to obey; he has soldiers to command, and knows that a word of command suffices to march them hither and thither as he wills. And whatever he orders his slave to do must be done. He evidently regarded Jesus as a commander over superior spirits, to whom He only required to issue His orders for them to effect the cure; to him, therefore, Jesus' person became something supernatural, as was not unlikely should be the case with his still semi-Gentile consciousness. This is what explains to us the piety with which he prevented the Master from coming. Jesus, however, was astonished, and said, I have not found such great faith in Israel (Matt. viii. 8–10). There, too, people had hoped for His assistance, because it was seen that He had aided others; but no one asked how it was that He could help, and therefore this faith never extended further than to belief in perceived or narrated miracle. This Gentile formed for himself a conception of Jesus' person in which his confidence could be firmly rooted. Undoubtedly it was a highly superstitious trust, but was he, in his semi-Gentile fancy, very far from knowledge of the truth? Did not the angels ascend and descend upon the Son of man to bring Him divine aid? And was it not involved in the unique character of His person, that they ministered to Him at all times? It was not because of correct conceptions as to the manner and means of His assistance that Jesus was now applied to for help, but because He was regarded as the Helper whose word might be surely relied on: He Himself was quite aware that He could directly promise divine aid to the petitioner, "Go thy way; as thou hast believed, so be it done with thee!" And the boy was healed in that very hour (Matt. viii. 13).

As the oldest form of tradition knew of those points only, it innocently assumed that a story about a captain at Capernaum must have happened in that very town.[1] John names the real place where it occurred, and has preserved one other important reminiscence of the details. In his Gospel the servants of the house meet the father on his way home, and inform him that the child's condition has improved;[2] and on inquiring more particularly, he learns that yesterday at one o'clock, *i.e.* at the very hour when Jesus spoke the words of promise, the fever yielded, and the child was saved (John iv. 51–53). Criticism has certainly had some justification for jeering at the father's culpable dilatoriness, or at his comfortable tranquillity of mind, if he rested for the night either on the way or in Cana; but they only make this miraculous representation doubly so by explaining how the evangelist, although he could indicate the distance by a word, desired to show us its entire extent in order to make the greatness of the miracle more manifest. It must not be forgotten, however, that in Palestine the day began at sunset, and that however quickly the father might journey, he could scarcely travel some five or six hours before nightfall, so that it might easily be the following day when the servants met him. There is really no exaggeration here at all, we only learn the more particular confirmation of what the older narrative gives such express prominence to (Matt. viii. 13)—

[1] The unanimous assertion of modern criticism, that the fourth evangelist, in order to magnify the miracle, removed Jesus three *good* geographical miles from the place of healing, is a pure and simple extravagance. If the peculiarity of the narrative consisted in the invalid recovering at the word of Jesus without His personal presence, the miraculous is not increased by the number of kilometers which separated them.

[2] Mention must have been made in Luke's source of a second message, which, after the commencement of the healing crisis, declared Jesus' coming to be unnecessary. But it is not possible that the manner can be original in which Luke joins this trait with the second half of the narrative borrowed verbally from the apostolic source. That the centurion, immediately after having besought that Jesus might come (Luke vii. 3), should send friends to hinder this coming (ver. 6), besides being inconceivable in itself, is manifestly a blending with a similar incident from the story of Jairus' daughter, of which even the purport puts one in mind (comp. Matt. v. 35), especially as the justification of this parrying, comprehensible as it is in the mouth of the captain, seems intensely awkward, indeed perfectly impossible, in the mouth of the messengers (Luke vii. 6 ff.).

how, at the very hour in which Jesus spoke that word of promise, the boy recovered.

Nevertheless, the Johannine report seems to present a great difficulty, inasmuch as John appears to apply the real points of the older narrative quite differently. In the one case the captain protests against Jesus' coming, in the other the king's officer urges Him repeatedly and with increasing importunity to do so (John iv. 47, 49); in the one the captain is blamed by Jesus, in the other he seems to be included in the reproof directed against the ordinary Jewish faith in wonders (iv. 48); in the one assistance is promised because of his faith, in the other the way in which his petition is granted seems to have been the first test of that faith (iv. 50).[1] Although done by older critics out of their partiality for John, it is quite impracticable to abandon on John's account the oldest tradition containing the words of the centurion, — words which could not possibly be invented, although the representation does not come up to the Johannine in clearness. It does not explain how the father's simple request for his sick son could occasion Jesus' harsh condemnation of the faith which constantly desires signs and wonders, especially at this period when, apart from what He had gone through at the Passover, Jesus had scarcely had opportunity for learning by experience of this belief in miracles, nor is it comprehensible why Jesus should grant this request in the most surprising way, when it was simply presented a

[1] Current apologetics solves this difficulty by the simple declaration that these are two distinct naratives, just as at an earlier date Luke, on account of his deviations, was supposed to have related quite a different story from Matthew. In both cases, however, the theory has little probability, for the elements of the stories are absolutely identical. A high official at Capernaum, and a son sick unto death; a simple word from Jesus, and the cure of the far-distant son at that very hour; and finally, as we have seen, the sending afterwards of servants or of friends, and the general resemblance of the period in Jesus' life. But even the points which are apparently heterogeneous contain, when they are looked into, the very same elements. A reproof of the current Jewish belief in wonders (John iv. 48) is involved also in the words of Jesus contained in Matt. viii. 10, and the faith in Jesus' word, made so expressly prominent in Matt. viii. 8, is also commended in John iv. 50. What remains, then, is the single topical difference that the petitioner in the older narrative is a Gentile, while in John iv. 48 he appears to be included among the Jews who were blamed. But, indeed, the entire dislocation of the points occurring in the Johannine representation is connected with this direct reproof.

second time, although He had seemed to refuse it by that reproof. On the other hand, it is equally impossible to see in the Fourth Gospel an intentional re-formation of the older narrative, as no motive for such a proceeding can be shown.[1] Nothing is left, then, but to explain this remodelling as being unintentional, and we may recollect in regard to this, that John, who at that time had in all probability returned to his home, knew of the occurrence from hearsay only, and in his memory it may very likely have become confused with similar incidents, such as when Jesus really gave utterance to a censure of the prevalent semi-belief before proceeding to heal the sick son of a greatly distressed father (comp. Matt. xvii. 17). Surely the didactic standpoint from which John apprehended and represented this history was formed by his desire to show how Jesus, like a true instructor, endeavoured to lead the ordinary belief in miracles which He had esteemed so insufficient at Jerusalem, away from Himself (John ii. 23–25; comp. iii. 2, 11 f.) up to the faith in His word that is so commended in the Samaritans (iv. 41 f.). In the pursuit of this didactic aim John overlooked the fact that Jesus did not first generate belief in the petitioner, but only assisted him in confirming it, and that therefore the censure of His country-people which is involved in Jesus' words could not be addressed at the same time to the father, who, according to the older tradition, did not belong to them at all. On the other hand, his representation retains the correct reminiscence, which was already obliterated in the older narrative, that Jesus did not promise help when the petitioner first asked for it. It is not generally noticed that the promise of assistance, which is so expressly actuated by the bold words of the centurion (Matt. viii. 13), cannot have been given immediately

[1] Strauss soothes himself with the empty subtlety, that the Logos Christ dare not let His offer be outbidden by human belief, but that the requirement of the common belief in miracles had to be surpassed by His proffer of healing at a distance. Baur has apprehended the idea of the Johannine narrative most spiritually, when he shows how belief in wonders is destroyed when it becomes faith in the word of Jesus, for then the miracle cannot be said to be any longer strictly necessary. This idea, however, can be introduced as readily into the older form of the narrative, in which faith is rewarded precisely because it rose to belief in the mere word of Jesus, and which, moreover, from the introduction of the Gentile, must have particularly suited the universalistic tendencies of the evangelist. This remodelling does not therefore explain the narrative.

(viii. 7). The reply to the father's daring request, which was at first most vividly presented in the form of a grievous lament (viii. 6), was Jesus' promise to come; the centurion was only assured of miraculous assistance when, far from regarding this coming as insufficient, he declared it to be unnecessary, because his faith was satisfied by Jesus' words.

To those who deny the miraculous, this narrative presents an insoluble difficulty. It was self-evident to the older Rationalism that Jesus sent one of His disciples to Capernaum with the necessary remedies, and that His words were only to be taken as a medical prognostication of the effect of these means; surely, then, the newer criticism has no right to imagine it occupies a higher level when, in the place of external means of healing, it simply puts the faith of the son, of whom we know nothing, or when it assumes that the boy was affected by the father's return, although, according to the oldest account, the recovery began at the hour when Jesus spoke the word of promise. Criticism is right in rejecting every idea of a mental effect having been produced when the parties were separated by distance,—an occurrence which at the most could only take place with immaterial spirits,—as well as every analogy from magnetic healing forces, operative from afar; it is evident that in this case, where Jesus had no connection whatever with the invalid, no natural interposition of a corporeal or psychical kind can be admitted.[1] The usual idea that Jesus cured the sick boy by an action of omnipotence, proceeding from Himself or from His words, has the whole tenor of the narrative against it, as well as Jesus' express declaration regarding the production of His miraculous results (John i. 51). For neither in Matthew (viii. 13) nor in John (iv. 50) does Jesus utter a word of command; it is a

[1] If the authenticity of the narrative is disallowed, then nothing is left but to regard a story, guaranteed by a twofold apostolic authority, as myth or fiction. Strauss rests this view on curious logic; if the prophet Elisha, without quitting his house, cured Naaman the leper simply by commanding him to bathe seven times in Jordan (2 Kings v. 9 ff.), the Messiah could not be content to show less miraculous power than this. He might also have added, without fearing that his explanation would be too convincing, that this Naaman, who experienced the prophet's kindness, was a Gentile (Luke iv. 27), and showed just as great an extent of unbelief to the old prophet as the Messiah found this Gentile to be possessed of faith. The second method of explanation has been pointed out by Weisse. His idea, however, that we have before us a misinter-

word of promise which is carried out by God, who alone works miracles. But that Jesus could so speak in unconditioned confidence that what He said would be confirmed, is the clearest sign of the uninterrupted communion with His Father, in which He could attempt whatever He desired, because He only willed what was in unison with the will of God. It is certainly not unintentionally that John gives prominence to the fact that this was the second sign which Jesus performed in Galilee, and that directly (as ii. 11) after returning from Judea (iv. 54). He evidently regards the opportunity for such a sign having been given to Jesus immediately on setting foot in His native place, as the promise of a peculiarly fruitful ministry there. Certainly the first to be benefited was not one of His countrymen. Jesus had left the half-Gentile Samaria in order to devote Himself to His own people (John iv. 43 f.), and now the first-fruit of His redemptive ministry was brought to Him in the person of this Gentile. What may He not have thought of this wondrous dispensation? The first evangelist seems to have had some idea, and so he puts in Jesus' mouth the prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of Israel (Matt. viii. 11 f.), the totally different historical connection of which we find in Luke (xiii. 28 f.). This event, however, sent a ray of hope into that distant and glorious future, which the prophets had held out even to the nations of the Gentiles.

There were dark signs in the heavens, but Jesus interpreted them as the long-looked-for call to action, and to the unfettered development of His true Messianic ministry. Scarcely had He greeted His home when the startling tidings passed through the province that the mighty prophet had been taken prisoner by the ruler of the country, and now languished in the unapproachable fortress of Machærus. Herod Antipas

preted parable, cannot be taken into consideration, for the whole character of the narrative presents no analogy whatever to the recorded parables of Jesus. It must rather be looked upon as a profound fiction, in which the centurion is the representative of the Gentile world. While the Jews rejected the Christ who sojourned among them in person, this Gentile world did not expect Jesus to come and tarry personally in her dwellings; and yet the Gentiles learnt to know the world-wide ministry of Jesus, bounded, as it was, by no limits of time or space. Christ, however, really sought out the Gentile world through the apostles sent out by Him, and He saved it not by miraculous distant effects, but through the operation of His gospel.

resided in his capital, Tiberias, which he had built on the western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, in honour of his imperial patron; an undertaking which, notwithstanding the productiveness of the neighbourhood, could only have been accomplished by artificial means. He had probably troubled himself little about the prophet at the Jordan, although John had, latterly at least, come considerably nearer. His marriage with the daughter of Aretas, his neighbour on the Arabian frontier, had brought peace throughout his borders. But on one of the journeys to Rome he unfailingly took in order to fortify himself in the Emperor's favour, the light-minded prince made the acquaintance of the wife of his half-brother, who was living in Rome as a well-to-do private person.[1] Herodias was a grand-daughter of Herod the Great, and daughter of the son Aristobulus whom he himself put to death, and it was probably against her will that she was married by her grandfather to her uncle. Ambition and passion induced her to consent to the wishes of the tetrarch, who proposed to marry her after his return from Rome. When the Arabian princess heard of these plans, she took refuge with her father. Herod, however, did not hesitate to commit this double adultery, and concluded the marriage with Herodias, although it was unlawful, for, excepting in certain cases in which the law expressly commanded it, marriage with a sister-in-law was prohibited (Lev. xviii. 16). The Baptist did not hesitate to censure this public scandal; he had an opportunity of telling the prince to his face that his marriage was a direct infringement of the law. For this offence he was now suffering in fetters (Mark vi. 17 f.). Josephus, indeed, alleges as a reason, Herod's political apprehensions;[2] but for these the Baptist's

[1] This brother was the son of the priest's daughter, Mariamne, and is simply styled Herod by Josephus. Mark (vi. 17) calls him Philip, and it is usually supposed that there is a confusion here with the tetrarch Philip, who was a son of Herod by Cleopatra from Jerusalem. But since Herod was only his family name, it is quite possible that the other was his proper name, although it was somewhat singular for two of Herod's numerous sons to bear the same appellation. Two of the others, however, Antipater and Antipas, were essentially identical.

[2] Comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 2. He reports also that John was imprisoned in Machærus, a strong frontier fortress to the east of the Dead Sea, which had recently belonged to Aretas, and had probably been obtained by Herod on his last visit to Rome. Here John was securely removed from any attempts at deliverance that might have been made

ministry gave no occasion, not even his reference to a Messianic future, which he himself was not to bring about, so it is clear that this was only the ostensible reason for his incarceration. It could not well have been openly avowed what the treason was that had led to his imprisonment; and, as we shall see, the real doer of this was not the pusillanimous ruler, but the princess, who had every reason for closing the mouth of this stern preacher of morals.[1]

The Baptist's day was past. Jesus must have seen in this a divine token that the days of the Messiah, *i.e.* of His own Messianic ministry, were come. Nothing could now be said of His again taking up the baptism of repentance with which He had endeavoured to prepare the people in Judea. The new age was dawning, and it required such fresh and unequivocal preaching of the kingdom of God as had not yet been heard even in Jerusalem (John ii. 24).[2] It must have been of some

[1] It is vain to attempt deducing a sure chronological datum from this imprisonment, or from the marriage of Herod, for the one did not necessarily follow directly on the other. It is only certain that the journey to Rome, during which the tetrarch came to an understanding with Herodias, took place before the death of Sejanus, who died 31 A.D.—for Herod was after that accused of having conspired with him. Possibly, then, it was about the close of the year 28 A.D. that the arrest of the Baptist took place. Keim has recently endeavoured from this very point to alter the whole chronology of Jesus' life as hitherto received, and by simply rejecting a notice of such absolute certainty as Luke iii. 1, has placed the execution of the Baptist, which took place not long after his imprisonment, *six* years later (at the end of 34 A.D.). The grounds he has produced for this change are decidedly feeble, for it is equally conceivable that in the year 36 the people may have regarded Herod's defeat by his former father-in-law as a divine punishment for the murder of the prophet, although seven years had passed; it certainly cannot be proved that this war broke out soon after the marriage with Herodias, for Josephus says distinctly that the beginning of the enmity with the Arabian king dated from the repudiation of the daughter of Aretas, and that later other causes of dispute arose, particularly concerning the frontier (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 1).

[2] It is therefore true that Jesus did not appear in Galilee preaching the kingdom of God (Mark i. 14) until John had been removed by the hands of his enemies, and perhaps, too, that His appearance was induced by the Baptist's departure from the scene; only the first evangelist has made a mistake in representing it as if He "withdrew" into Galilee (Matt. iv. 12), for in truth it was there He came within Herod's jurisdiction. It is equally correct to say that Jesus' true Messianic ministry first began now, although Mark's narrative so places it only because his voucher, Peter, formed from this time one of Jesus' constant escort. But the fact of the first and third evangelists, who were plainly indebted to Mark for their entire chronological framework, regarding this appearance as following directly upon the temptation, and as forming generally

moment to Jesus to mark this new epoch in His ministry by at once surrounding Himself with a circle of constant companions, whose after destiny required, moreover, that they should be eye-witnesses of His Messianic ministry from the beginning (comp. Acts i. 21). For that reason He repaired from Cana to the Lake of Gennesareth, where the men lived with whom He had already been connected at the Jordan, and who, as followers, had been frequently in His company in Judea. It was then that, passing along the lake, He caught sight of Simon and his brother in their boat busy fishing. Hailing them, He commanded them to come and accompany Him as scholars. This meant, indeed, that they must quit their trade, for that was not compatible with the permanent connection of discipleship. But He offered them instead a new and analogous calling, but only of a higher kind; He will make them fishers of men. It is true they were not to be so immediately, but were to be fitted by Him for gathering human souls into the kingdom of God. This appeal was all that was necessary; they left their nets and followed Him. At a short distance farther on, Jesus observed the two sons of Zebedee in company with their father and his hired servants. They had pulled their boat ashore, and now sat mending their nets. The narrator makes it intentionally marked how in this case no specially reasoned command was necessary. Without further preliminaries, Jesus called, and they followed. They could do it without impiety, for they left their father with his hired servants, who gave him what assistance he required in his trade (Mark i. 16-20).

The older criticism knew what it was about when it declared this narrative to be a pure myth. Just as Elijah

the commencement of Jesus' public ministry (Matt. iv. 17; Luke xxiii. 5; comp. Acts i. 22), must be explained by the disappearance in the popular tradition of every reminiscence of the earlier ministry in which He did not appear in the characteristic manner of a subsequent period. This accounts for John's tarrying with such evident predilection over these beginnings in which he was probably Jesus' only constant companion, and, on the other hand, for his passing silently from the Galilean period, with its changing incidents, which he had introduced as so important (iv. 43 ff.), until he takes up the thread again at the crisis which began there (vol. i. chap. vi. comp. p. 129). It is owing therefore to its rejection of the Fourth Gospel that modern criticism takes what is really the most secondary report (Matt. iv. 12-17) as the basis of its whole construction of Jesus' history.

threw his mantle over Elisha, who left his cattle and followed him (1 Kings xix. 19 ff.), so, it is said, did the Messiah call His apostles, and, though unprepared, yet, like Elisha the prophet, they were obliged to obey at once. This scene is in very truth incomprehensible; taken in itself, it mocks every kind of psychological conceivableness. What could induce these fishermen suddenly to exchange their trade for teaching, and to follow a man of whom they must have been in absolute ignorance as to who He was, and what His intentions were, more especially in the case of a mature man like Simon, who had to leave his house and family? They were not acquainted with Jesus, nor He with them. Surely, then, this either throws doubts upon Jesus' discretion in the choice of His disciples, or else He must be credited with a heart-searching penetration more divine than all His miracles. What the actual state of the case was can be gathered from the Johannine narrative, and from that alone.[1] The truth is, that these men knew Jesus long before, and were well aware of His being the Messiah of Israel. The call was addressed to Simon in particular. Long ere this Andrew had freed himself from his trade: he was one of John's disciples, was the first of them to make Jesus' acquaintance, and had probably aided Him during His baptismal ministry in Judea. On Jesus' return home, Andrew, like the two sons of Zebedee, seems to have gone back to his craft for a time. But these three knew that the hour would come for Jesus to begin His true Messianic ministry, in which they were to be His companions. They were now only awaiting the summons, telling them that the time had come for abandoning everything and following Him. In the case, therefore, of Zebedee's sons, there was no neces-

[1] By rejecting this narrative modern criticism has placed itself in what is not a slight embarrassment (John i. 35–43; comp. vol. i. p. 372 f.). To declare this foundation-pier of the oldest tradition a myth, is to destroy its whole credibility. Keim devotes many pages to the endeavour to make the narrative comprehensible at last, although the process undergoes various changes; a more or less lengthened ministry, followed by great results, is always said to have preceded this, although it is never mentioned in the introduction to the Gospels (Mark i. 14 f.; Matt. iv. 12–17), and is manifestly excluded by the description of the first impression made by His appearance (Mark i. 22–27). Then Jesus is said to have somehow watched the sayings and doings of the fishermen, although nothing is known of it in our narrative, and it is precluded by what the two sons of Zebedee say.

sity for giving reasons for the command. It was like a matter already agreed upon. He called, and they followed. Far otherwise was it in regard to Simon. His acquaintance, too, Jesus made at the Jordan, and a glance into his heart had disclosed what great things Jesus might hope for His cause from this man. He returned, however, to his home and handicraft, and yet he of all others was the one who could not be spared from the number of those who from the first were to surround Jesus as His disciples, and as the witnesses of His words and deeds. It was he above all that Jesus sought as He passed along the lake. He offered him a new and higher calling, and He demanded a great sacrifice. But it is in perfect accordance with the character of the man, as we have learned to know it, that he should quickly make up his mind to obey the summons, for is it not the Messiah who is calling him? To be numbered among His confidants, to stand closest to Him when the glory of the Messiah's kingdom dawns,—for this Simon is ready to sacrifice everything. His younger brother is included in the summons. Andrew had expected that this would be so, and obeyed willingly.

In his own peculiar source Luke found a distinct account of this call of the apostles (Luke v. 1–11).[1] This form of the tradition still retains the recollection that that call was in strictness addressed to Simon only; in it, too, Simon appears as having been long acquainted with Jesus, and Jesus with him. Jesus encountered the fishermen as they were washing their nets, and, according to Luke, addressed Himself to Simon, with the request that he would push out a little from the land, so as to enable Him to instruct the multitudes from the ship; for reasons involved in his composition Luke inaccurately places the story in the very middle of Jesus' public

[1] Harmonizing expounders have affirmed, indeed, that it is the same. They wish to make out by this that both are right, and yet they themselves declare that Luke is wrong. The way in which, without any justification whatever, the sons of Zebedee suddenly appear at the close, and are included in the call (ver. 10 f.), shows unanswerably that Luke regarded the story as being the same as what Mark narrates, what had apparently been forgotten in it he recovers from Mark. But in the narrative of his source the appointment of Peter only was in question, the word about catching men was said to him alone (ver. 10), although he had comrades in trade alongside of him in a ship of their own (v. 7; comp. ver. 2).

ministry. But Simon not only placed his bark at Jesus' disposition; when Jesus commanded him to put out into the deep and let down his nets, although he had fished in vain the whole night through, and, being a skilful fisherman, knew there was no catching anything that day, yet he promised immediately at Jesus' word to try once more. People may estimate the impression made by Jesus' preaching as high as they please, but on this ground to credit Him with a miraculous knowledge is more than can be reasonably expected. This is probably the reason why Luke placed the story at a time when this Simon had seen many miracles wrought by Jesus, yea, even in his own house (iv. 38–41). In his source, however, this must have been the first proof given of Jesus' miraculous power, as is evident from Peter's astonishment and terror (v. 8 f.); and yet even here it is involuntarily betrayed that Simon knew very well who was before him, and what he might expect from Him (v. 5).

In this tradition, then, the story of Simon's call has a totally new incident added to it—the miraculous draught of fishes.[1] In itself it is quite conceivable that God's blessing could bestow a bountiful draught in the morning, although the whole night had been toiled through in vain. But Jesus' knowledge that this would be the case, and His certain promise to Simon regarding it, is in no sense different from His promise to the centurion, that his son should recover; and when it was a question of winning a Simon, then He had the divinely miraculous aid at His disposal as certainly as He possessed a superhuman knowledge in the case of Nathanael or

[1] Of course, it is at once suggested by criticism that this is an after-colouring. The promise of becoming a fisher of men was not presented to Simon in figurative language only; it had to be made still more impressive by a great symbolical miracle. The number of fish he caught at Jesus' word that day represented the men he should some day take. Once on this track, the riddle-proposing phantasy put no bridle on itself. As Simon fished the whole night and caught nothing, so had he afterwards to labour long in Israel without winning a single human soul. So, too, at Jesus' word, he put farther out into the deep of the Gentile world and drew there a great draught. Last of all, there were two boats to fill,—the Gentile-Christian and the Jewish-Christian Churches. Then the net began to tear; and it is well known how the opposition of these two sections for a time threatened the Church with a grievous schism. But the draught was brought safely to land, to the confounding "of the circumscribed Jew through whose instrumentality this divine action had been brought about."

the Samaritan woman. On this account really unprejudiced critics have sometimes found in this report the oldest and most accurate representation of Simon's call. Weighty considerations, however, stand in the way of this. Mark, who relates the story to us in the same vivid way he had heard it from Peter himself, says nothing of this draught of fishes; and how could he, who experienced it, forget or pass it by? Add to this, that in one point at least there is a great want of clearness in the narrative. If Simon was confronted with Him who, as the Messiah of Israel, had come to save His people, and who had verified this by the miraculous assistance He was able to dispense, then he might well feel in his utter sinfulness who it was who stood before him; but how, then, can he beseech the Messiah to depart,—the only one who can save and help, who only requires sincere repentance to grant him willingly the forgiveness of His Father,—this is what is so difficult to understand. Now we do know of such a miraculous draught of fishes on the Lake of Gennesareth; it is related in the Fourth Gospel (John xxi. 1–11), and the order is almost exactly the same. We know what at that time was lying on Simon's mind,—that wicked denial of his Master in the court of the high priest's palace,—which may have so agitated him that he felt himself unworthy of ever again being to his Lord what he had been before. We know that after this draught of fishes Jesus addressed him in profoundly earnest words, putting him in mind of his denial, and how He then reinstated this disciple in the position of confidence he had so forfeited (John xxi. 15–17). Surely in this we have the simplest explanation of this deviating tradition? The source from which Luke took it shows in other ways many remarkable reminiscences of the peculiarly Johannine tradition (comp. vol. i. p. 80), and one of the kind we have discovered already in the story of the centurion's son. But in this case the narrative of the call of Peter had evidently been confused with that of his reinstatement in the office which had been conferred on him, and so the story of the miraculous draught of fishes which is connected with the one is now conjoined with the other.

Accompanied by His first four disciples, Jesus proceeded to Capernaum, which was at no great distance. It was

Friday evening, and the Sabbath had now begun. This was the day He had decided on for His first appearance there. Mark's narrative will detain us for some time over that day in Capernaum of which Peter must have spoken so frequently and fully, for this was the first time that Jesus publicly appeared in Simon's native place, and honoured his house by entering it.

## CHAPTER V.

### IN THE SYNAGOGUE.

THE legal worship of the Old Covenant recognised only one central sanctuary. To it alone might sacrifices be brought, and at it the great feasts of the nation be solemnized. The more the need of participation in religious things was there satisfied, the more could private devotion suffice for ordinary life. The Exile, however, had deprived the nation of that centre, and had led to synagogue worship being instituted as a substitute. The synagogue, of course, could not make up for the temple as a place of sacrifice, but it was not prevented by the letter of the law from being a new centre of religious intercourse, a "house of assembly," and so continuing the legal form of worship agreeably to the present necessity. The historical origin of this development is uncertain; but at the time of Jesus every considerable town in Palestine had its synagogue. Their arrangement was usually very simple, forms or seats for the congregation, a reading desk for public discourse, and an ark or chest for keeping the sacred rolls. The people gathered together on Sabbaths and holy days, and in a sitting posture united in a prayer said by the leader in the name of the congregation. After that followed the reading of the portions of Scripture, taken from the law and the prophets, which were allotted to the particular Sabbath, and then an explanatory discourse or an edifying address, sometimes even a conversation, connected with the same.

The privilege of instructing was open to all, it was not connected with any distinct office. There was indeed a special class who had made teaching their life's task, the Sopherim, *i.e.* copyists or scribes, because the study had to begin with the ability to copy the law. These learned men alone could read the law in the ancient sacred speech,

explain it, and apply it to all the circumstances of public and private life. Such scribes[1] were to be found in all parts of the country, and they more than others were able and willing to come forward in the synagogues. Held in high honour by the people, they looked down upon the common folk with the unlimited prejudice of culture (John vii. 49). They claimed the chief places at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogue; solemn salutations in the market-places, and titles of honour, such as Rabbi, Mar, Ab (Master, Lord, Father), were what they expected and received (Matt. xxiii. 6–10). If occasionally no competent scholar happened to be present during the service of the synagogue, the leader had also to be lecturer. In general, however, it was through the agency of the scribes that the synagogue became the nursery of acquaintance with the law and of fidelity to it. This worship, too, called out the need for a common organization, and, especially in the dispersion, formed the base on which the nation was kept socially together; a president directed the whole conduct of the synagogue (Mark vii. 35; Luke xiii. 14), and watched over the regulation of the assemblies; in these duties he was assisted by the elders (Luke vii. 2). Besides the leader, the synagogue had still another official in the attendant [sacristan], who took charge of the sacred books, saw to keeping the place in order, and opened and closed the building. To the presidency of the synagogue was conjoined a species of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in regard to censure and exclusion from the synagogue, and even extending to the infliction of the lash (Matt. x. 17), a punishment which was there carried out publicly.

These meetings in the synagogues presented Jesus with the most fitting point of contact for His public ministry.

[1] The Sopherim are usually styled Scripturists in the German Gospels; but after the Exile the more the centre of the national religious life was formed by law, so much the more would all scriptural erudition be concentrated round it. For this reason the oldest source seems to have called them lawyers, a name which is still retained in some passages borrowed from it (Matt. xxii. 35; Luke x. 25, xi. 45 f., 52, xiv. 3, vii. 30). We must distinguish from the scribes the true teachers of the law (Acts v. 34; comp. Luke v. 17) in Jerusalem, who lectured and disputed in the halls of the temple (Luke ii. 46), and by whom those literati were educated.

In all our Gospels the accounts given of the commencement of His ministry mention His teaching in the synagogues (Mark i. 39 ; Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35 ; Luke iv. 15, 44 ; John xviii. 20), and give repeated examples of His doing so (Mark iii. 1, vi. 2 ; Luke xiii. 10 ; John vi. 59). In every place the preference of speaking seems to have been willingly accorded to Him ; afterwards, when the growing conflicts with the public teachers of the people appeared to threaten Him with exclusion, it is probable that Jesus purposely avoided the synagogues. From his special source Luke depicts vividly such a synagogue scene. When the opening prayer is over, Jesus rises and presents Himself to read. The clerk of the synagogue hands Him the roll of the prophet, which He unfolds, and then reads the sacred text. Rolling it together again, He gives it to the attendant, and sits down to begin His discourse, while all eyes in the synagogue are fixed upon Him with intense expectation (Luke iv. 16–20). The procedure was the same on that day in Capernaum ; and Mark describes, as he had probably heard Peter often do, the powerful impression Jesus made on His first appearance in Peter's native place. People were beside themselves with astonishment ; they all saw, however, that His teaching was very different to that of the scribes who had hitherto come there. He taught as one having authority, *i.e.* as one who, speaking as the prophets did with a high commission, along with the right receives also power to move the hearts of men. In contrast to Him, the real teachers of the people seemed like incompetent orators, who propounded the petty and miserable inventions of their own wisdom (Mark i. 22).

Unfortunately we do not possess so much of any one of Jesus' synagogue sermons as would enable us to form any clear conception of their tenor and form. Even from that scene in Luke we only learn that He expounded a passage from the prophets (Isa. lxi. 1 f.) as being fulfilled by His appearance (Luke iv. 21), and that the speech therefore consisted essentially of the demonstration of this accomplishment. Jesus acknowledged the Old Testament Scriptures in their utmost extent and in their perfect sacredness. The Scripture cannot be broken, He said in one place

(John x. 35), and then proceeded to found His argument upon it. Of course, He must have meant by this the Scriptures as handed down by tradition,[1] and must have viewed them exactly as His age did; any kind of superior knowledge in regard to these things would have made Him unfit for coming to an agreement with His hearers on the use of Scripture, or would have necessitated a far-reaching accommodation, which without intrinsic falsehood is inconceivable. Everything narrated in those books, then, He accepted as actual history, and regarded the separate portions as having been drawn up by the men to whom they were ascribed by tradition.[2] Even the divinity of Scripture, and how it was brought about, He can only have conceived of in the same form as His contemporaries did; and yet all that is said about this is, that the sweet singer of Israel was moved by the Spirit, *i.e.* by the divine Spirit (Mark xii. 36).

Jesus was convinced that the Scriptures had testified, and that Moses had written of Him (John v. 39, 46). This was a self-evident assumption if He was conscious of being He who was to fulfil the Old Testament promise. But certitude was not rooted in the perception that isolated prophecies were fulfilled in His person or history, but in the depths of His own self-consciousness; and this, as we have seen (comp. vol. i. p. 297 f.), rested upon the assumption that the collective revelation of the Old Testament pointed to a perfecting of religion as it was established in Israel, but had never been thoroughly realized in its national life. If Jesus was to bring this realization about, He had only to carry through what the whole of the Old Testament had in view.

[1] A sentence in which He gives examples from Genesis and 2 Chronicles of righteous men who had been murdered (Luke xi. 51), shows us that He read the Scriptures in probably the same form in which it now lies before us in the Hebrew Bible. On this very account it is most improbable that He employed as Holy Scripture the so-called apocryphal books and the other books which at His time were highly esteemed among the Jews, but this does not preclude the possibility of His being acquainted with some of them, and of His attaching His discourse to a suitable quotation from them. He, of course, would prefer to employ prophetical texts in his sermons in the synagogues.

[2] The whole law, including Deuteronomy, He ascribed to Moses (Mark i. 44, vii. 10, x. 3); the 110th Psalm, agreeably to the superscription, He held to be Davidic (Mark xii. 36), and the Book of Jonah He regarded not as a didactic fiction, but as a purely historical narrative (Matt. xii. 40).

It is evident that He regarded certain promises of the Old Testament as being fulfilled in His own person, but what special promises He applied to Himself we can hardly ascertain.[1] In the present day we endeavour to understand each separate prophecy from its entire context and the historical situation in which it was spoken, but it cannot be said that in this connection Jesus regarded and employed the Old Testament differently from His contemporaries. This historical view of the Old Testament, and its explanation according to strictly hermeneutic methods, was absolutely unheard of in His time. Any probability that extraordinary information on this point had been communicated to Him, would have entangled Him afresh in the difficulties of His hearers which we have already considered. It was the highest esteem for the Old Testament that caused Him to regard each separate word,—without looking at its connection and historical situation,—not as what the prophet wished to say to his own age, but as what God through it would now say to Him and His contemporaries. The entire Old Testament was to Jesus a prophecy of Himself and His appearance, and from this standpoint each separate prediction appeared to Him in a new light and of deeper significance, not indeed disclosing its historical sense, but teaching how the religious significance of the Old Testament revelation and its place in the history of redemption was to be understood in the last analysis. Undoubtedly, then, He discovered prophecies, not alone in detached utterances of the prophets, but the sacred institutions of His people, as well as its divinely guided history, were to Him a great prophecy of the salvation that appeared in Him.[2]

[1] It is absolutely certain, not only from Luke iv. 18–21, but also from Matt. xi. 5, that He applied the prophecy in Isa. lxi. 1 f. to Himself; but not until His action and fate had been further developed could He infer any reference to His person from prophecies of a very different description.

[2] In the expression used in John ii. 19 we have already seen how Jesus entered into the idea of the temple He was first perfectly to realize in the kingdom of God; in John iii. 14 we saw Him draw conclusions from an Old Testament history as to what lay before Him. It was a habit of His age to see in the persons and events of the Old Testament history types, *i.e.* prophetic prefigurations of the Messianic era, and Jesus doubtless did the same. Thus He apprehended the fate of Elijah (Mark ix. 13) as a type of the Baptist's fate, and applied the story of Jonah to Himself (Matt. xii. 40). In isolated cases, indeed,

Although in principle, then, Jesus occupied exactly the same hermeneutic standpoint as His contemporaries, yet His application was totally different.[1] The exposition given by the scribes of His time alternated between the extremes of a massive literalism, the consequence of which was a vapid disputing about words and a keen contention about trifles, and a boundless and arbitrary allegorizing; thus, in contempt of the simple literary meaning, introducing into the letter of Scripture their subtle investigation of trifles that they supposed to be so profound, but which in truth were frequently without taste or meaning. The Old Testament was to Jesus no wrestling place for the dry learning of the schools, but a living fountain out of which He drew the great thoughts of God, laid down in the records of revelation. While others approached the Scriptures with a traditionary system of thought and doctrine, from which, notwithstanding its orthodoxy, the spirit of the Scriptures had long departed, He, whose inner life rested upon constant communion with God, always felt Himself sympathetically affected by the spirit of genuine religious life which breathed in the sacred books; He had a natural affinity for what they disclosed to Him. Independent sources of religious knowledge were open to Jesus, whose results, without being deduced from it, harmonized with Holy Writ, offering indeed the right key for its comprehension, so that people got the impression from His teaching that He spoke with another authority than did the scribes.

The true purport and centre of Jesus' preaching was not

it may not be possible to decide with absolute certainty whether He typically refers a saying from the Old Testament to Himself and His time, especially as the form in which our evangelical tradition reports its application is in no way determinative; but we are certainly not on this account justified in affirming, for the pupose of approximating His view more to ours by considering these predictions as somehow brought about typically, that Jesus found direct prophecies in the Old Testament.

[1] It did not occur to Jesus that for the fulfilment of Mal. iv. 5 (iii. 23) it was necessary for Elijah to descend bodily from heaven, as was taught by the Rabbis; He regarded this prophecy as being completely fulfilled in the Baptist (Matt. xi. 14; Mark ix. 13). Even where He lays stress on the words themselves (John x. 35), it really depends on the fundamental idea which they express; and where He appears to be furthest removed from the words, and to have most freely introduced His own thoughts into the sacred text (Mark xii. 26 f.), it is perfectly evident that He is only deducing the final result of the Old Testament conception.

formed by a religious instruction, or an ethical command, but by the glad tidings of the kingdom of God.[1] He nowhere expressly stated what this kingdom of God was; He treated the idea as one widely spread among the people. It is therefore a mistake to look upon this conception as having been fashioned by John, or to endeavour to understand it from his statements. Looked at historically, Jesus can have meant nothing but what naturally followed from the peculiar nature of His people and their views. At all times Israel neither should nor would be anything but a theocracy, *i.e.* a kingdom whose supreme Lord and King was Jehovah, and whose only law was His holy will. But the devout souls in Israel knew how true it was that this ideal had never been completely realized, although it would surely come to pass in the future; they knew, too, that with this realization the nation would receive the promised salvation, and the plenitude of God's blessings even in regard to earthly things. The kingdom of God which Jesus proclaimed could therefore be nothing else than the realization of this ideal, the consummation of the theocracy. A kingdom in which God's will is as perfectly carried out on earth as by the angels in heaven (Matt. vi. 10), is the kingdom of God in its most perfect sense. It is not only concerned with the consummation of religious life in the inmost sanctuary of the heart, or with a representation of this in a purified worship, but above all, with a carrying of it out in all the relations of national life, in the family as well as in social and political existence. But because this fulfilment

[1] It appears very doubtful whether Jesus Himself described it as the gospel, for this expression was probably first introduced from the apostolic phraseology (Mark i. 1); but it is absolutely certain that, conformably to Isa. lxi. 1, He characterized it as the proclamation of glad tidings (Matt. xi. 5). It is with perfect correctness described by Mark as the glad tidings coming from God (Mark i. 14); by Luke as a proclamation of glad tidings (xx. 1), the purport of which was the kingdom of God (viii. 1); and by Matthew as the gospel of the kingdom (iv. 23, ix. 35). The first evangelist is the only one who employs the expression "kingdom of heaven;" but if this expression was employed by Jesus, and was preserved in the oldest source, it must have been owing to a strange accident that Matthew should retain it, and not the other evangelists, who were also acquainted with that source. Every attempt to derive this expression from Daniel has been in vain. He describes how the kingdom of God is to be realized in heaven, and therefore the statement must belong to a period when, after the fall of Jerusalem and the Jewish state, every hope of an earthly realization of the kingdom of God had been given up (comp. vol. i. p. 64).

of the divine will in all the relations of national life must necessarily be followed by the bestowal of richest divine blessings, intelligence of this kingdom of God was always given as glad tidings.

The more exact burden of this message has been stated by Mark in these words: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (i. 15).[1] This expression was founded on the idea that a period determined on in the counsels of God had to elapse before the era of salvation could arrive. This time had now gone by, for God Himself had put an end to the forerunner's ministry by giving him into the hands of his enemies. Now, therefore, the era of salvation must begin in which all the prophecies of Scripture would be fulfilled. And thus it was that Jesus could appear with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God was at hand, *i.e.* that the promised and expected consummation of the theocracy would now take place. An attempt has been made, though in vain, to weaken this into a mere summons to the people to begin a new life, and by so doing to grasp the certainty of the consummation. Only a matchless visionary could imagine the possibility of rousing the people, by no other force than his own enthusiastic words, to the realization of this ideal. That was a task at which the prophets had all laboured in vain, and which had been left by generation after generation to the succeeding one. Without the employment of new ways and means, of fresh motives and inducements, it was impossible to conceive of this realization. But, indeed, it was known to all Israel that the consummation of the theocracy could only be brought about by Jehovah Himself. Something had therefore to happen which would guarantee the immediate approach of the kingdom of God, and to Jesus' consciousness this was the realization of that ideal in His person and in His life, along with His own certainty of being sent to realize it in the national life. The call to Him to commence His true Messianic ministry was at the same time the guarantee for

[1] Since the message with which Jesus afterwards charged His disciples, when sending them for the first time independently through the country, was to the effect that the kingdom of God was at hand (Matt. x. 7), Mark's formulating of it may be regarded as directly authentic; it is equally indubitable that the fact of the time being fulfilled was the ground-thought of Jesus' synagogue sermon, when fastening on the prophecy of Scripture He proclaimed its fulfilment.

the completion of His task (comp. vol. i. p. 302). Assuredly the consummation of the theocracy as Jesus conceived of it could never come upon the people without His intervention. For this reason Jesus always conjoined a summons to faith and repentance with that good news (Mark i. 15). This faith, however, was not a belief in a species of doctrine regarding His person, for He never taught anything of the kind, but it was the firm conviction that the sending of Jesus meant that the time was come when Jehovah would organize a new kingdom out of the old. This certainty of belief was to be the lever which should give enduring power and lasting energy to the resolution to repent, when come to by the people. Even at the outset we see a radical difference between the true Messianic announcement and the preaching of the Baptist. It was in view of the approaching judgment, which had to precede the consummation, that the Baptist called the people to repentance. This preaching of his may have called forth a salutary apprehension in the nation, but it could not bring about a lasting renovation. Jesus was aware, as we have already heard in the talk with Nicodemus, that the era of salvation would not commence with the judgment; that through Him God offered the promised consummation to the whole nation. Not the fear of judgment, but faith in this gracious act on God's part, was to be the impulsion to the repentance He demanded. That could not be effected by a renewal of the prophet's preaching of repentance, but by the Messianic glad tidings that the kingdom of God was nigh, and that through faith in this every one might receive power to participate, through sincere repentance, in the glory of this kingdom.[1]

It has been thought possible to prove that Jesus' tidings of the kingdom of God passed through various stages, that He at one time announced it as future, then as present, and then finally as future; this it has been supposed signified a change in His conception of it. But the matter is really very simple. At first Jesus could only announce the nearness of the kingdom of God; for that was to be realized among the people.

[1] It is clear from this that the first evangelist is not correct in putting the same proclamation word for word in the mouth of the Baptist (iii. 2) as Jesus employed on His first Messianic appearance (iv. 17; comp. vol. i. p. 309).

But then this ideal was, to begin with, only realized in His person and life, although this fact seemed to show that the fulfilment of the hope of Israel was close at hand. The greater the number of adherents gathered around Him, who through faith in His fulfilment of the promise had begun a new life, the more certainly could He see in this circle the beginning of the realization of the kingdom of God. He did not say much about it, for reasons which are easily comprehensible, since only the striving toward more perfect realization could make healthy progress follow on this beginning. But statements are not wanting which indicate that, under certain conditions, a direct share could be had in the kingdom of God (Matt. v. 3, 10; Mark x. 15), that there were those who had already entered into it (Matt. xxi. 31, xi. 11), and even that the kingdom of God had come (Matt. xii. 28; Luke xvii. 21). In all this Jesus never imagined that the complete realization of that ideal could altogether take place in the course of this world; there was to be a final consummation of the kingdom of God, beginning only in the next. An intervening question was, whether and in how far a consummation of the kingdom of God, even if only relative, would take place among His people. For it was undoubtedly involved in the historical idea of the kingdom that it should be realized in the form of the national theocracy, embracing the whole nation, and penetrating the entire national life (Luke xiii. 18–21). The prophets had promised that this should be, and this promise Jesus desired to fulfil. The solution of the question, however, did not depend on Him alone, but also on the conduct of the nation. In reliance on God's strength, He was able to create the needful conditions, but He could not constrain the people to agree to them, and to allow themselves to be influenced by what he had come to do. Every prophetic promise was either expressly or tacitly connected with the condition of the nation's conversion, and in the same way each and every result of His ministry was dependent on the position the nation took up towards Him. How far He would succeed in winning the nation over to His method of realizing in it the kingdom of God could be foreseen by no one.

Closely connected with this is a question which argues

imperfect apprehension, when it asks what position Jesus, with His tidings of the kingdom of God, took up towards the politico-national expectations connected by the nation with the coming of the Messianic era, or of the kingdom of God. For this does not refer to foolish and carnal hopes, as is frequently assumed without further inquiry, but to an essential element in the prophetic promise Jesus had come to fulfil.[1] Jesus never gainsaid the popular expectation, founded on the promises of the prophets, nor did He ever declare that they could only be fulfilled indirectly; the mistake did not consist in the general expectation that with the consummation of the theocracy in the religio-ethical sense would come a change in the politico-national conditions. For how could it be that the fulfilment of the divine will should not result in the greatest of divine blessings, and should not, in whatsoever form, transform the intolerable conditions under which the people groaned? Jesus Himself undoubtedly hoped for this, although His view of the Old Testament was sufficiently free and spiritual as not necessarily to connect such a transformation with His own accession to the throne. He expected, however, from His Father's miraculous power, that was always at His service, that ways and means would also be pointed out to Him by which to accomplish this last hope of His people. But the *how* He left to His Father, and the *whether* He made dependent on the nation's acquiescence in the manner in which, conformable to the divine counsel, He established the kingdom of God. It was the very reverse with the nation. It would only listen to *one* way of fulfilling its expectations, namely, through its Messiah ascending the throne and delivering them from the yoke of the Romans and their creatures. It would only hear of a consummation of the theocracy in a religio-ethical sense when this first condition was realized. Even the priest Zacharias himself declared this to be indispensable (Luke i. 68–75).

[1] It was really the idea of one Reimarus which Renan revived when he represented Jesus as appearing, after the Baptist's death, with tidings of the kingdom of God, the kernel of which was formed by the notion of a mighty and sudden revolution, or rather of an imminent world-wide catastrophe, and which he is therefore perfectly right in stigmatizing as the dream of a visionary, as a chimera and utopian scheme, although it in no way detracts from his admiration for Jesus.

In this way was Jesus' method of procedure sketched out for Him. If He had begun by proclaiming Himself the Messiah sent by God, all restraint would have been removed, and a Messianic revolution would have set in. The elements for this had been fermenting among the people ever since the days of the Gaulonites; and they would certainly have been ready to do anything for Him who, according to divine decree, was to take His place at the head of the nation during the Messianic era; there must, however, be no lingering. If He were to withdraw Himself from the people, they would have nothing more to do with Him, for they would look upon Him as not being in any sense their Messiah. This catastrophe was to be avoided, or if unavoidable, it had to be delayed until a bond was created between Him and the entire nation, or at least a sure kernel of it, which should hold fast even though His dearest hopes were destroyed. But this could only be done when conviction of His Messianic destiny had spread and been fast-rooted in the nation, and according to the degree in which He succeeded in mastering it spiritually, or in captivating it heartily either in whole or in its best sons. In this way the nation could be trained by degrees for receiving His view of the establishment of the kingdom of God. First, by persuading them that in His purely spiritual ministry He had bounties to offer they could no longer do without, and after they had once learnt to know this the certainty would grow upon them, that He, and He alone, could bring the fulfilment of all the promises. For this reason He never spoke of His calling directly, except when, as in the case of the Samaritan woman (John iv. 25 f.), the considerations which guided Him in His popular ministry fell away of themselves. He discovered a way by which to avoid denying, even before the people, the consciousness of the unique character of His calling, without in any way encouraging the hopes which were directly connected with the name of Messiah.

This is evidently the solution of the problem why He called Himself the Son of man, or, more correctly, always spoke of the Son of man, and left it to His hearers to conclude from the way in which He did so that He meant Himself (comp. John i. 51, iii. 13 f.). It follows from this, as a matter of course, that He did not wish to be designated the Messiah.

It is impossible to understand why, if this was what He wanted, He did not rather choose one of the designations of the Messiah current in the nation, and directly apply it to Himself.[1] It is true that Jesus, by this self-designation, did not describe Himself as a mere man, or in any way point to His lowliness and His path of suffering. For His contemporaries, Jesus' genuine humanity was beyond all question; and He did not require to begin by protesting that to Him, as man, nothing that was human was strange, or that being such He was subject to human weakness and capacity for suffering. This does not mean that His mere human experience was in any way a contradiction of the popular expectation of the glory of the Messiah; for however intense this expectation may have been, there was always the possibility that God would raise a man to this majesty. In truth, however, so soon as it is recognised that Jesus wished it applied to Himself, it is seen that the expression does not really say that He is a Son of man as others are, but it is rather the very opposite,—that He is the unique One among the children of men, the appointed Son of man, whose uniqueness needs no explanation to His auditors. But in this case the expression can neither have pointed to the contradiction between His humanity and a higher divine nature of which His contem-

[1] There is no doubt of the fact that at the time of Jesus the prophecy in Dan. vii. 13 f. was understood of a single person; but he who is there spoken of is one, like a son of man, who, coming in the clouds of heaven, is led to the throne of God, to be invested with the lordship of the eternal kingdom. Certainly in the so-called Book of Enoch the Messiah is frequently described, on the ground of this passage, as the Son of man. But even if the pre-Christian origin of the sections in question of the Book of Enoch were regarded as being absolutely certain, that is not to say that its prophecies were so well and familiarly known to Jesus, and to the circle in which He first laboured, for Him to assume that a reference to them would be quite intelligible. Moreover, the passage in Ps. viii. 5, which first lauds the goodness of God in interesting Himself in the children of men, although often applied to the Messiah even in the Christian age, did not in itself offer the slightest point of contact for the supposition that Jesus, by alluding to it, desired to characterize Himself as the Messiah. More than all, however, the setting of Jesus' question—Who do men say that the Son of man is? (Matt. xvi. 13)—contains unequivocally the remembrance that He did not regard this self-designation as a direct and therefore generally comprehensible reference to His Messiahship. Not till there was no longer any doubt as to Jesus' Messianic claim would people compare what was said of the Son of man with what was prophesied of the Messiah, as is done by John in chap. xii. 34.

poraries knew and suspected nothing, nor even to the idea of an archetype of humanity, a second Adam—such as *He* might have meant, but which would have been perfectly anomalous to His auditors. Israel knew of only *one* Son of man, who was to be what none before Him had been and none after Him could be—the Son of man whom Jehovah had promised to send, that through Him the consummation of salvation might be carried out; the expression could only refer to this His unique calling. It was undoubtedly left uncertain whether He would accomplish this calling, as the nation expected, by ascending the throne of His father David, and, as the anointed King, establishing the kingdom in all its old splendour. This seems rather to ask the people whether it would recognise its Messiah in what Jesus said about the Son of man and His calling, although it differed greatly from what the age awaited from the fulfiller of the promises; bringing the answer to this question home to the hearts of the people was really the only way of training it gradually to understand His method of fulfilling the promise.

We shall see that wherever Jesus used this self-designation, this must have been its meaning, and even when it occurs in John's Gospel (comp. iii. 13 f.). But we have also seen how John, from the height of his apprehension of Christ's eternal existence, put more into it than this; whenever he puts this expression into the mouth of Jesus, it can be proved that he was thinking not only of the unique character of Jesus' calling, but also of the uniqueness which belonged to His person in virtue of its heavenly origin and its eternally-divine existence. The expression cannot have meant this to His first hearers; and we must face the question whether, in the choice of that self-designation, Jesus may not, indeed must have been conscious that it involved far more than it expressed. It is a fact that Jesus afterwards reflected on Daniel's prophecy (vii. 13 f.), and it was in direct connection with it that He proclaimed His future coming in the clouds of heaven (Mark xiii. 26, xiv. 62). He knew then that He could not finish His work on earth,—that not until He had been exalted by death to divine glory would He fully accomplish His divine calling; but it is not impossible that He first combined the designation chosen by Himself with Daniel's

prophecy when the historical development of His life pointed to this issue. It is just as likely, however, that that prophecy was hovering before Him when He chose this designation; and precisely because He did not think of the manner in which it was to be fulfilled by Him, the way in which the Messiah was characterized in this passage, according to the Messianic view, must necessarily have led Him back to that profoundest secret of His self-consciousness which we have already spoken of (comp. vol. i. p. 305 f.). Was that person, then, who was brought on the clouds of heaven before Jehovah's throne to be invested with the noblest calling, not manifestly a celestial being? And had not the question as to His selection for the Messianic calling always led Jesus back to a time prior to His earthly existence? Even the choice of this designation shows us mysterious depths in Jesus' self-consciousness, which make the first query the more comprehensible the less we veil the other.

After all we have heard concerning Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God there can scarcely be a doubt as to how the people must have taken it. It is true that His preaching of the fulfilment of the time left it open to the nation to think of Him as a forerunner of the Messianic era; for the fact of the Baptist having designated his successor the Messiah, could only influence his own scholars or those who had implicit confidence in his word. But the more Jesus brought the fulfilment of the prophecy into direct connection with His person and appearance, and pointed to the unique character of His calling, the more closely had the people to face the Messianic question. There could assuredly be no doubt that as He was and in what He did, Jesus was not yet the Messiah they had looked for. Even His closest adherents did not believe this (vol. i. p. 374). But there was nothing to prevent them explaining the contradiction between His appearance and their expectations of the Messiah by the supposition that when the hour arrived God would also give His Chosen One the position of external dignity, which He required in order to the perfect fulfilment of His calling; it was undoubtedly in this way that the first disciples solved the contradiction. Modern criticism will not hear of any one among the people having thought of His Messiahship before

the triumphal entrance into Jerusalem. It is, however, absolutely unintelligible how this idea should have occurred to the people just then; for in the representation given by the older Gospels of His later ministry up to this point there is not only no new circumstance that could lead to it, but rather conversely, a gradual withdrawal from His popular ministry is apparent, more likely to stifle that idea than to call it forth. On the other hand, the increasing enthusiasm of the people for Him, characteristic of the first period in His ministry, would surely excite the hope that He was the Chosen of God. It certainly had to be learnt daily that the consummation of these expectations would have to be delayed, and this test was not an easy one to submit to. For this reason, belief in His Messiahship must always have struggled with doubts, and the question whether He was the Messiah Himself or perhaps only one of His forerunners was never quite laid at rest. But yet it is historically inconceivable that the possibility of His being the Messiah did not occur to the people; and we shall presently meet with events showing it to be impossible.

# CHAPTER VI.

## THE DEMONIAC.

IN the second Gospel it is thought worthy of record that the occasion of Jesus' first appearance in the synagogue at Capernaum presented an opportunity for performing one of those miracles which Mark, probably following in this his teacher Peter (comp. Acts x. 38), classed among His cures, and placed along with His most characteristic and impressive deeds of power (comp. Mark i. 23 with i. 34, 39, iii. 11). Every one in the synagogue was in amazement at Jesus' method of teaching, when a man with an unclean spirit gave vent to a loud cry of horror, as if to impel Jesus' departure. The wretched sufferer had a presentiment that He who more or less directly proclaimed Himself as the establisher of God's kingdom in Israel was the Holy One of God, come to put an end to the dominion of evil spirits, and to deliver them over to the ruin which even then threatened them, and having entirely identified himself with the spirits who swayed him, his object was to restrain Jesus from making them feel His authority.[1] Jesus, however, bade the evil spirit, speaking through the man, to be silent, and commanded it to depart. The stronger the sick man's suspicions that Jesus had authority over the evil spirit by whom he felt himself possessed, the greater would be the effect of the words used by Jesus when expelling

[1] What the demoniac said cannot have been retained by tradition with perfect accuracy, for what is put into his mouth in Mark i. 24 is manifestly taken from one of the best known narratives of the apostolic source (Matt. viii. 29), and does not exactly fit in here; the only reason for the plural used by the evil spirit was the unhappy man's conviction that he was possessed by a number of evil spirits, and, besides, on this occasion Jesus had as yet done nothing that would occasion such a repulse. These words, however, had a suitability for Mark, because he intended the narrative to be in a way representative of Jesus' exercise of power over the evil spirits, and had frequently heard Peter describe how the demoniacs had endeavoured in this way to prevent Jesus from driving them out.

it in rousing a hope of there being for him also a deliverance from the power of the evil one in whose ruin he was involved. But the more his fall into the realm of evil was owing to a voluntary submission to the same, the greater would be the struggle against the separation. An inward conflict began, manifesting itself outwardly in violent convulsive fits and wild outcry. These were popularly ascribed to the evil spirit, who once more manifested his power over the man, and then, giving a loud cry, quitted him. It was, in truth, to Jesus' word of power the spirit yielded, and the crisis ended with such complete recovery that those present were more than ever amazed at the man who not only knew how to teach divinely, but could in the power of God effectually command the evil spirits (Mark i. 23-27).

The evidences of Jesus' power over demoniacs must have played a prominent part in His ministry. Even the above-mentioned example shows how these unfortunates, in conformity with the popular idea, believed themselves to be possessed by evil spirits, whether one or more (Mark v. 9; Luke viii. 2; Matt. xii. 45).[1] Many kinds of superstitions were connected with this. Jewish exorcists, mentioned by Jesus Himself (Matt. xii. 27, comp. Acts xix. 13), in order to expel these spirits made use of certain charm formulæ, said to have originated with Solomon, as well as of roots, stones, and similar magical means. The assertion of modern apologists, that this was an influence exercised by the evil spirit upon the nervous system of the sufferers, comparable with the sympathetic effect in the sphere of animal magnetism, is only

[1] Both in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles these evil spirits are called demons, thus giving rise to the name demoniac, *i.e.* one who is tormented by evil spirits (comp. Luke vi. 18). From a designation applied once in the oldest source to them by Jesus (Matt. xii. 43), Mark calls them by preference unclean spirits, and is occasionally followed in this by the evangelists dependent upon him. Whether by the chief of these demons, mentioned in Matt. ix. 34, the devil himself is intended, or a particular evil spirit which rules over them, is not clear, for the name Beelzebub he bears in Matt. xii. 24 has not yet been explained with sufficient certainty. Even in the oldest source Jesus described His deeds of power as the performance of cures and the casting out of devils (Luke xiii. 32), and when sending forth His disciples He invested them with the same authority (Matt. x. 1); the later narrator, too, gives special prominence among those who were cured by Him to the demoniacs (Matt. iv. 24).

a new form of that old superstition. Even in the time of Origen the Greek doctors regarded and treated these complaints as derangements of the nervous system. Since the Rationalistic period an analogous view has become prevalent far beyond the bounds of Rationalism. It has been supposed that that age, with its scanty knowledge of the body and the mind, referred to the influence of evil spirits certain complaints which had something mysterious about them, either from the violent attacks that came on when the health was otherwise robust, or by reason of other inexplicable appearances; mental afflictions were especially so regarded, and this idea was in spirit reflected by the sufferers themselves.[1]

Our tradition, however, opposes serious obstacles to this view. It is not improbable that the evangelists shared the popular notion concerning these diseases; there are many examples tending to show that their ideas regarding certain complaints were not without influence on their representation of the narrative of healing under consideration (see previous remarks). People have even gone so far as to suppose that the author of the Fourth Gospel must have held a different opinion regarding these maladies, from the fact that not a single instance of demon expulsion occurs in his account. But this idea is quite inconceivable in the case of an evangelist who gives such prominence to the fact of diabolical power being the final reason of the hostility against Jesus, and who not only makes the devil enter into Judas (xiii. 27), but repeatedly speaks of demoniacal possession, although not manifested bodily (vii. 20, viii. 48 f.); and, besides, it is by no means clear that he considered madness to be the sole outcome of this possession (comp. x. 20 f.). If his view of these

[1] In support of this it is possible to appeal to the inclination apparent in our Gospels to refer even common diseases to the action of demoniacal powers, or even to regard the sufferers as being possessed. Indeed, the statement of the centurion in Matt. viii. 9 is understood by many as if he supposed that Jesus had authority to command the spirits who had induced the sickness. But even in Luke iv. 39 Jesus rebukes the fever just as He usually does the evil spirits whom He expels. The narrative in the oldest source of the lunatic boy (Matt. xvii. 15) has been apprehended by Mark as if a fit of epilepsy were in question, the result of demoniac possession (ix. 17 ff.); and so, too, with Luke in regard to a narrative from his own peculiar source (xiii. 11–16), which plainly refers to a case of paralytic crippling, as is clear from ver. 12 f.

diseases had really been different, John would assuredly have given us a like narrative from his point of view, and so have cast fresh light upon the subject. It is impossible that he, who throughout presupposes the older tradition, can have thought to rectify this mistaken idea by silence regarding this kind of malady.[1] If it is certain, notwithstanding, that the Gospels, whether resting directly or indirectly upon apostolic reminiscence and tradition, retain the popular opinions of these maladies, this means that they mirror Jesus' view also. But, in truth, even Jesus did not apprehend them otherwise.

It has undoubtedly been affirmed that Jesus only concurred in the fixed ideas of the sufferers for therapeutic reasons, and that He could do this the more easily since the conditions of a rational conversion did not apply to the weak in mind. But this rests on the perfectly indefensible assumption that these sufferers were all insane; for there is, in truth, not the slightest trace of rooted ideas, excepting perhaps in Mark v. 9. Then, to say the least, it is highly doubtful whether concurrence in the fixed ideas of a madman answers to any rational method of healing. Such a momentary accommodation would in any case be only justified if, whenever the end was attained, instruction as to the real state of the case followed, preventing the false conclusions which might otherwise have been drawn from it. There is not the slightest indication, however, of any such setting to rights; on the contrary, Jesus speaks constantly to the Pharisees and people, indeed to His disciples, of these demoniacs in a way which assumes that He essentially shared in the popular conception. His defence against the Pharisaic reproach of a demoniacal alliance not only proceeds on the

[1] The eclectic manner of narration followed by the Fourth Gospel and the transparent plan of its composition, which excluded absolutely such outward points of view, as well as any intention of giving an example of each way of healing, makes it useless to ask why John tells of no expulsions of demons. It might just as well be asked why he does not give a single instance of curing a leper or a mute, although these very cases would have fitted in perfectly with his metaphorical conception of Jesus' miracles of healing. It was in every way a most unfortunate fancy of Strauss, that as the fourth evangelist did not wish to serve up a loathsome account of a leper to the cleanly Grecian world, and as exorcism seemed to him to be brought into such bad repute by jugglers and deceivers, he preferred to keep his heroes altogether separate from that line of things.

reality of a Satanic realm, but assumes throughout that diabolical powers have their activity disturbed when He casts out devils (Matt. xii. 26–29). To a mere *argumentatio ad hominem*, however, from the presuppositions of the opponent the reproach raised against Him was too serious, and the consequences drawn by Him from it (comp. particularly xii. 28) too weighty. It is a mistake to appeal to the alleged typical use made of this notion in one of Jesus' popular addresses (Matt. xii. 43–45). What in this case is properly symbolical (allegorical) is the idea of the man's soul being a house first inhabited and then left empty by an unclean spirit, who, attracted back by its inviting appearance, returns bringing comrades along with him. On the other hand, as we shall see, parabolic speech in itself presupposes the fact of demoniacal possession being a reality of the lower life, whose laws are interpreted as prefigurative of those of the higher state of existence. Above all, however, the speech in which Jesus discourses with His disciples concerning their expulsions of devils (Luke x. 17–20), shows that He regarded them as a real victory over the Satanic powers. It is useless to say that errors are here in question whose suppression was not included in His calling as teacher, or that it was not His task to give either the disciples or the people explanations belonging to the province of scientific psychological or medical science. If this conception really belonged to this department of knowledge, there is no ground for assuming that Jesus in regard to it advanced beyond the popular conception; thus it will be necessary to pass from Schleiermacher and Neander, Weisse and Schenkel, all of whom assume some kind of accommodation, to Strauss and Renan, Hase and Keim, who openly aver that Jesus was a sharer in this erroneous opinion of His age.

But is this then only a question in psychology? That is the mistaken supposition which is involved in the modern view of these narratives. These appearances were never so apprehended by Jesus and His apostles. The latter do not make the least distinction where it is customary in the present day to discriminate between demoniacal possession as affecting the body or the mind, just as Satan is said to have entered into Judas (John xiii. 27; Luke xxii. 3),

when he acted under an impulse given by the superhuman power of the evil one, so Jesus disputes the allegation that He had a demon, *i.e.* was possessed by one (John viii. 49; comp. Mark iii. 30), as those were from whom He cast out the devil (Mark vii. 25). The demoniac was in the power of the evil spirit who spoke by him (Mark i. 23), in the same way that the sweet Singer of Israel was in the power of God's Spirit when inspired by Him (Mark xii. 36). The radical matter of fact was simply this, that the sinful condition had reached a height where the man no longer had the mastery of sin, but sin of him; and when sunk in this utter impotence, and possessing no will of his own, he yielded to the enslaving power of sin, this dominion is referred to a superhuman spiritual power which held sway over him, and deprived him of all volition. It is impossible to say that it was in consequence of His perception of the profound ethical causes of these cases that Jesus advanced beyond the popular idea. For although, in accordance with the nature of every popular idea, the spiritual was apprehended somewhat sensuously, and the transcendental was represented more under the analogous forms of earthly reality, yet by reason of its training in the law and the prophets, Israel can never have entirely lost the consciousness that the opposition between God and the power inimical to Him turned finally on opposition to His holy will and beneficent purpose.[1] What was most striking about the appearance of these so-called demoniacs was the conjunction with this yielding to Satan and to the power of sin of a state of disease, whether of psychical or bodily character, which is regarded as the result of their moral condition. The profound internal connection, however, which often exists between mental and bodily diseases and the sins of which they are the consequences, Jesus not only expressly recognises (Matt. ix. 2; John v. 14), but it is confirmed by universal experience. This explains how those sufferers retained a consciousness of their moral

[1] It is therefore absolutely unimportant whether the form of these demonologic conceptions was independently imprinted in the later Israelitish consciousness, or had been received from the Parsees, mixed with the crassest superstition. In either case, the kernel of the idea was consciousness of the terrible dominion of sin, which ruled mankind with superhuman power.

bondage by the powers of darkness, such as usually did not appear before the beginning of moral deliverance. In these cases, indeed, that consciousness was worked on by the sight of the results produced by sin, while it was usually the bitter experience of its external consequences which led to its recognition. As a matter of course, this consciousness must have been expressed in the forms of the age; and since the current conceptions were replete with demonologic ideas of the most fantastic character, the misery of their condition can be imagined when, whether bodily or psychically ill, they were possessed by the idea that they formed the habitation of devils; and, abandoning themselves to the evil desires of those spirits who gloated over the agonies of humanity, they saw nothing before them but the certainty of accompanying them sooner or later to hell. It is evident that even in the case of those whose malady was not originally psychical, this state of things might ultimately produce insanity.

The current conception of these appearances, however, is grounded on the assumption that the sufferers belonged to the class of the mentally afflicted only. But this supposition is in no way confirmed by our sources. We possess, indeed, one example which undoubtedly refers to the severest description of madness and violent mania (Mark v. 2–5). It is perfectly arbitrary to suppose that the demoniac in the synagogue was a sufferer from religious frenzy; that would be to regard the idea of subjection to the powers of darkness as a symptom of religious madness. We really know very little about the character of the maladies that were conjoined with demoniacal possession; for even the convulsions of the demoniac in the synagogue do not appear so much as symptoms of disease as they demonstrate the commencement of the salutary crisis. Only one other case is certainly corroborated, and in that the sufferer was also deaf and dumb (Matt. ix. 32, comp. Mark ix. 17–25); it can be inferred from another passage that on one occasion there was a conjunction with blindness,—the closing of another organ of sense (Matt. xii. 22). But although the cases where epilepsy and lameness are referred to demoniacal possession really belong to the later conception, it is evident, notwithstanding, that

writers well acquainted with these occurrences did not regard them as being anything uncommon. It is undoubtedly true that psychical and mental maladies most frequently appear as the consequences of deep immersion in vice and sin, but they include also nervous complaints of every kind to which the deadening of the nerves of sense was really due, as well as the maiming and irritation of the motor nerves. But to whatever extent psychical complaints may generally have been reflected in bodily diseases, there is no certain boundary line in the mysterious connection between the life of the body and that of the soul.

Then again, the usual conception regarding these phenomena in no way explains their frequent occurrence in Palestine at the time of Jesus.[1] It is not enough to appeal to the fact that in all ages insanity has appeared in undeniable connection with deep-seated spiritual disturbances and startling political events; for these cases do not always present true insanity, nor, apart from the agitation excited among the people by Jesus Himself, does that period present the spectacle of any far-reaching spiritual movement. On the other hand, it is easily comprehensible that Jesus appeared at a time when the ancient world seemed to a peculiarly large extent to have been abandoned by all the forces of health and vitality, and therefore to have fallen more deeply into sin and under the powers of darkness. It was precisely the theocratic soil of Israel, however, which presented the conditions that made an awakening to the consciousness of this condition possible. Whatever form had been taken by the ideas of the reality of a Satanic kingdom and its powers, they at least led to the recognition of the depth and extent of the awful power of sin, and so presented points of contact for referring back certain maladies to their radical moral cause, as well as for the consciousness which was roused in the sufferers themselves of the ultimate origin and true nature of their condition. Above all, however, the

[1] It may be conceded that Mark's vivid descriptions of the pressing of the people to Jesus perhaps makes the number of these unfortunates appear larger than it really was; but the remembrance of how such sufferers were constantly encountered by Jesus, as afterwards by His disciples, is too distinctly impressed on the oldest tradition for it to be unhistorical.

usual view fails to explain the difference between ordinary sicknesses and those referred to demoniacal possession, which was doubtless acknowledged at the time, and which finds expression in the oldest sources. There were even then those who were deaf, dumb, blind, epileptic and lame, in regard to whom no one thought of demoniacal possession; and it cannot be proved that mental disturbance, which had arisen notoriously from physical causes, was regarded as demoniacal. The consciousness of the sufferers cannot have been decisive on this point, for according to that view it is only to be regarded as a reflex of the popular idea, and that age will scarcely be credited with a discrimination, grounded on exact observation, between conditions of disease resting upon bodily and upon psychical causes.

Even the weird phenomena of that twofold existence manifested by the demoniac in the synagogue, which has so deeply impressed itself upon the tradition, is not explicable by the ordinary view. When those possessed by devils came to Jesus, they must have done so in the hope of being delivered from their condition. But although a horror-stricken repulse of Jesus' influence is in the oldest source only attested historically in one case (Matt. viii. 29), yet the same incident is in Mark's narrative (i. 24) plainly typical; it is only descriptive of what Peter represented as usually happening in such cases. It can only be explained by the inward contradiction in the spiritual life of these unfortunates between the longing for deliverance and the bias to the powers whose accustomed influences it neither can nor will do without. This it was which produced those phenomena at the commencement of the health-bringing crisis, of which the example narrated by Mark is plainly representative, and which we have endeavoured to analyse psychologically. In close connection with this is another fact for which the current view offers no explanation, namely, the fact that these demoniacs began by invoking Jesus as the Messiah (Mark i. 34, iii. 11). From its disputing the statement that belief in Jesus' Messianic destiny had then been awakened in the people, the newer criticism is prevented from assuming that this invocation only reflected the popular consciousness; this assumption, however, is absolutely proscribed by these sources

if the invocation really followed upon Jesus' first appearance in the synagogue (Mark i. 24), or was actually uttered by the maniac on the eastern shore, who, shut out from every kind of human companionship, could not have known Jesus personally (Matt. viii. 29).[1] Besides, this incident is only comprehensible if the unfortunates were really influenced by a superhuman and spiritual power which was not only aware of its outward opposition to the Holy One of God, but also of His authority over the realm of evil, which He as the Chosen of God had come to destroy. Under this influence the sufferers would at once recognise Him to be the Messiah, to whose saving power they felt themselves as greatly drawn as they shrank from His judgment-power.

While the older Rationalism found scarcely anything more offensive in the history of Jesus' public ministry than His expulsion of devils, it has recently become fashionable to regard them as the most comprehensible of His miracles of healing. Indeed, there is no disposition to reduce them entirely to that level. It seems natural that a thoroughly healthy man might assist the recovery of those so afflicted by the powerful impression he produced on their distracted spirits.[2] But in this it is overlooked how these explanations almost cancel the special supposition as to the nature of this appearance. It is perfectly evident that in the case of real insanity, or of an actually diseased state of mind, all suppositions fail which present a spiritual influence brought about by Jesus acting psychologically.[3] When Jesus en-

[1] Nothing else is left for criticism but to pronounce this incident to be a simple misunderstanding and exaggeration on the part of the evangelists, or else to agree with Strauss that it is pure fiction, however inseparably it is connected with the oldest reports of these events. It was reserved for the modern superstition, calling itself apologetics, to regard it as a species of second sight.

[2] It has been supposed that Jesus impartially placed His own results side by side with those produced by the Jewish exorcists (Matt. xii. 27); if this were so, it would afford some ground for holding that the evangelists had nothing to do with instituting inquiries as to their non-continuance. It is also supposed that Jesus openly confesses in Matt. xii. 43-45 that dangerous relapses might occur even in those cured by Him, although even if this be really contained in the words, it proves nothing against the genuineness of the actual cure.

[3] Renan deduces from this the theory that the mental disturbances which were pronounced to be demoniacal possession were often very slight, and were really nothing but singularities. Keim, too, regards the cures as affecting only

deavoured with a touch of irony to screen His expulsions of demons behind those wrought by the Jewish exorcists (Matt. xii. 27), that was done because the calumny brought against Him of accomplishing them in the power of the devil showed how even His most determined opponents must have acknowledged that totally different powers were efficacious in those cases than in the ones which they attempted. They could not deny away the impression which, according to the oldest source, was made upon the people from His casting out of devils,—that it was never so seen in Israel (Matt. ix. 33); they were compelled to avow that superhuman forces were in operation, only they senselessly pronounced them to be Satanic. Jesus Himself, however, after exposing the inconsistency of the calumny, showed clearly how there was only one explanation for His casting out of demons, namely, that He expelled them in the power of the kingdom of God (Matt. xii. 28). Even here He did not ascribe it to any superhuman power which was His by nature, but to the Spirit of God, who caused Him to utter the word of deliverance, and made it effectual. On the other hand, Jesus must at one time have said in regard to a particularly bad case, that this kind could come out by nothing except by prayer (Mark ix. 29). Only if prayer calls down divine assistance—whether it be asked for by one of these unfortunates or by those who are endeavouring to cast out the demon—can God's power loose the fetters, which from their more than human character mock all attempts at self-deliverance. Precisely because these cases were radically grounded on man's giving way to sin, producing a condition which made him a slave without a will, an interference by divine spiritual power could alone deliver him from this servitude. For this reason Jesus would not, even here, connect the divine aid which He mediated with any condition whatsoever on the side of the sufferer. When God sent one of these cases across His path, He knew that it gave Him an opportunity of showing that His task was to break the dominion of the devil and of sin, which hindered the coming of the kingdom of God. Thus, then,

melancholy and morbid states of mind, idiosyncrasies of temper, obstinacy, and perverted imagination. And yet he himself calls the account of the maniac on the eastern shore the best authenticated.

there was nothing needed but a word spoken in the name and by the authority of God to proclaim the sufferer's deliverance, and thereby to effect it.[1] Along with this, however, the power of the psychical or physical disease, which was the consequence of the possession, was of course broken, and recovery began.

It was this particular incident which roused anew the amazement of the people, that the deliverance of these unfortunates from their agonizing condition began at a simple word from Jesus (comp. Matt. viii. 16), without diffuse conjurations and manipulations such as they were accustomed to in their own exorcists (comp. Matt. ix. 33). The more weird the manner in which they were usually driven restlessly about by their consciousness of the state of the case, the more clearly would the fact of their deliverance force itself upon them. In this way the deeds of power wrought by Jesus formed an initial and luminous testimony to His specific calling. He certainly did not appear in this instance as a pretender to the throne, promising the nation the satisfaction of its politico-national desires. But it could not remain hidden from any profound inquirer, that He who in God's power broke the dominion of the devil, was come to prepare the way for God's dominion over the nation (Matt. xii. 28), and therefore to bring about the consummation of the theocracy. These acts of power must plainly have testified to His Messianic calling in the spiritual sense. But to those who did not themselves understand the signification, that might almost have been suggested by the oft-repeated invocations of Jesus as the Messiah

[1] This utterance would naturally take the form which made the sick man conscious of his deliverance, that is, it would shape itself after the conception he had of his condition, and which in reality had been only too thoroughly verified. So certainly as the deliverance could only rest upon a really divine operation, just as certainly must it have been mediated psychologically to the sufferer himself in a regular manner, although the first conditions of this mediation were created by this divine operation. There is no question here of an exorcising formula or of a direct command to the evil spirit, but in this manner the demoniac had certainty given to him that the power of the evil one over him had been broken. Nothing is certainly attested in the oldest source but the simple—Go, in Matt. viii. 32; but the way in which Mark i. 25 describes how Jesus commanded the spirit to be silent, and to depart, must go back upon Peter's descriptions of these expulsions (comp. Mark ix. 25). That He cast out the devil (Matt. ix. 33) is manifestly the simplest form in which a fact, elsewhere attested in the oldest source, is clothed (Matt. ix. 33).

by these demoniacs. Even if the idea had never occurred to the apathetic people that Jesus might be the Messiah, these phenomena raised the Messianic question in their very midst. We understand, indeed, how Jesus, who in order not to encourage the nation's revolutionary hopes kept back the direct testimony of His Messiahship, would least of all desire to be acknowledged the Messiah by mouths so impure, and for this reason always imposed silence on the demoniacs (Mark i. 34, iii. 12). The fact had now, however, been proclaimed, and the nation was obliged to take up a position towards it. It is these very expulsions, therefore, which preclude every possibility of the question not having been early ventilated among the people, whether or not this Jesus was the Chosen of God, who was to bring about the fulfilment of all the promises (comp. Matt. xii. 23).

# CHAPTER VII.

## AT THE HOUSE OF SIMON.

WHEN Jesus left the synagogue in company with the two sets of brothers who had recently been called, He betook Himself to Simon's house. It is not said in the oldest narrative that he had, as Luke represents, been implored to heal Simon's mother-in-law who lay sick of fever (iv. 38). These first disciples never thought of making use of their new connection with the great man for remedying their petty domestic exigencies. It sounds indeed more like an apology for apparent lack of hospitality, when He is told how the mother-in-law is situated, who seems to have been the only one in charge of the house (comp. vol. i. p. 369). Jesus, however, advanced to the sick-bed, and taking the sufferer's hand, raised her up. The sick woman was immediately sensible of recovery, the fever left her, and she was able to attend upon Jesus and His companions (Mark i. 29–31).[1] While they were still sitting at meat the daylight faded. The Sabbath had come to an end; and now no longer prevented by the day of rest, the people brought all manner of sick and those possessed with devils before the house of Simon, so much so that at last the whole town was gathered in a crowd at the door, for many came through curiosity to see if the expected

[1] The two redactors of Mark were sensible of the necessity for stating more minutely the manner of the cure; Matthew (viii. 15) mentions the touching of her hand, a trait which, however, occurs also in Mark. Luke iv. 39 represents Jesus as rebuking the fever (comp. note, vol. ii. p. 78), which he describes in ver. 38 as being a particularly severe one. This is generally regarded as suggestive of Luke's calling of physician, without considering that no diagnosis whatever could enable him to infer from Mark's laconic account whether this fever was one of those classed by his Galen. The consideration was much more likely to occur to him, that a fever, to cure which Jesus employed miraculous aid, could not be one easy to get rid of. Modern rationalism, as represented by Schenkel and Keim, certainly holds the reverse of this. It puts in place of the ordinary means recognised by the older rationalism, a gentle

cures would take place. It was certainly not the healing of the fever patient, the report of which could not possibly have spread through the town in so short a time, but it was the appearance in the synagogue that made the inhabitants of Capernaum hopeful that Jesus would be able to heal their sick also. But even this would hardly have sufficed if Jesus had not been preceded by the fame of the miracle-worker of Jerusalem. Their hopes were realized, for He healed many that were sick, and cast out many devils (Mark i. 32–34).

It has recently been usual so to represent this occurrence as if Jesus on this His first visit in Capernaum was, half against His will, and by reason of the conflux of people, pressed into performing miracles, and that He felt this constraint to be a burden and a disturbance of His proper ministry. Our sources, however, offer the most distinct contradiction to this theory. John represents Jesus as having already appeared in Jerusalem with miracles of healing (ii. 23, comp. iii. 2, iv. 45), and even assumes, besides, that the multitudes were attracted to Jesus because of His cures (vi. 2); not only so, but Mark too represents the crowd as repeatedly seeking and obtaining cures from Him (iii. 10 f., vi. 55 f.); and the later narrators make it specially prominent how His entire ministry was divided between teaching and healing (Matt. iv. 23 f., ix. 35; Luke v. 15, 17). Even in the oldest sources Jesus Himself points to these acts of healing as forming an essential branch of His ministry (Matt. xi. 5, xxi. 23; Luke xiii. 32). This mistaken view, however, is connected with the supposition that the cures of Jesus were rather an involuntary consequence of His spiritual ministry, and that the belief in His ability to cure somehow brought about an actual improvement.[1] This

and soothing word and a comforting and refreshing exhortation from Jesus. The return of her son-in-law and the presence of the honoured guest restored the patient to clear and joyous consciousness, while the sympathizing hand laid on hers produced a new and beneficial current of sensation and ideas, and proved a powerful stimulus of volition in which the feminine honour involved in the entertainment of her guests had not the last place. As the involuntary result of an approach which was not actuated by any such intention, the cure is quite comprehensible, quite "rational;" for we have all, whether in days of sickness or of health, or in troubled and depressed situations of every kind, experienced the invigorating influence of friendly words, of cheerful society, and even of a simple shake of the hand. (See Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, ii. p. 166 f.)

[1] Schleiermacher supposed that in these cures something of the nature of the

idea has no foundation in the case of the centurion's son, who was not present himself, and therefore makes it impossible to conceive of any spiritual influence having been produced by Jesus. But yet it seems as if there were some truth in the conception. It is a matter of fact that Jesus and His disciples could not heal where they found unbelief (Mark vi. 5 f.; Matt. xvii. 16 f.); that in those statements which are the most authenticated He made the cure dependent on the patient's faith (Matt. ix. 22; Mark x. 52), and that He inquired directly as to the faith of the sick (Matt. ix. 28), or sought to touch them in some other way (John v. 6). But it is equally evident that this cannot be so apprehended as if faith was the really effective factor in the cure, for it was not always the faith of the patient which Jesus demanded. It was on account of the centurion's faith that He promised to heal his son (Matt. viii. 13; comp. xv. 28); the raising of Jairus' daughter He made dependent upon the father's faith (Mark v. 36; comp. John xi. 40, and in particular Mark ix. 23); and even the oldest narrative represents Jesus as proceeding to heal the sick of the palsy, when He saw the faith of those who had brought the man to Him (Matt. ix. 2). Although it seems as if, whenever Jesus' successes in healing were brought into actual connection with His entire religio-ethical ministry, they would surely increase in the same degree in which that was spreading among the people, yet as a matter of fact the greater number of

miraculous might be conceded, in so far as unique spiritual effects might be produced by Jesus' perfectly unique personality. But in consequence of the mysterious connection between the corporeal and psychical life, it is manifestly impossible to say of these results how far their after effects would influence the organic life, and so might be operative in curing sicknesses. Taken in this sense, it was thought that the cures could be restricted to the sphere within which the power of the will over the body, which exists at other times, although to a less degree, can be observed. Just for this reason psychical disturbances have recently been more believed in; and since it is supposed that they can be demonstrated most certainly in the case of the demoniacs, they have principally been reduced to these cases. We have ourselves learnt from a classic example how it was supposed possible to refer even the cure of fever to such "spiritual therapeutics." People speak of a violent agitation of spirit, which was reflected in the corporeal life and its diseases, but whose effects belong to that sphere of faith in which minds are most deeply moved. With his ironic sturdiness Strauss speaks of "phantasy cures," in which the patients' faith that they would be healed by Jesus was the actual cause of their really experiencing a momentary improvement. For what length of time this continued is quite another question.

the cures belonged to the earlier time, and at its very climax Jesus complained of His religio-ethical ministry having been without result in the towns where the most of His miracles had been performed (Matt. xi. 21, 23). Faith, therefore, can in no way have been the operating factor, but can only be understood as having been the condition of healing in a religious sense. There was, of course, no question of belief in any particular truths or in any specific conception of Jesus' person; it was religious faith in the divine help which was to be obtained through Jesus. As we shall see in the account of the woman with the issue of blood, it was quite the same whether He was only regarded as being a messenger from God, who performed miracles of healing such as the old prophets had done, or whether His appearance was in any way connected with the coming era of salvation; it was equally unimportant whether this faith was founded on a clear confidence in God, or whether the conception of the hoped-for cure was in any way tainted with superstition. But since faith was in every case the condition of each experience of divine grace and blessing within the province of the religious as of the outer life, this divine dispensation must necessarily have belonged to the sphere of these manifestations of grace. The existence of this faith was certainly demonstrated by the coming of the sick to Jesus; but the fact of an express question being only reported in isolated cases by no means excludes the possibility of such interrogation having taken place more frequently, for we shall see presently how little we are really told about the precise method of cure.[1]

This religious limitation of His cures renders it abundantly

[1] It may be said that such a condition would also have stood in the way of unsuccessful attempts, and we shall see afterwards that a case of this kind actually occurred with the disciples (Matt. xvii. 16 f.). With respect to Jesus this could certainly not be alleged, for the vigilance of His adversaries would undoubtedly have led to His being upbraided with such cases. But they could not occur, not because that piercing eye of His, which searched the hearts of men, could not be deceived as to the existence of that condition, but because, as He had learnt in the wilderness, He could not work miracles in every case where need called to Him, but only where God commanded Him, to aid. It was not "the instinct of genius" that preserved Him from making abortive attempts, but His own unique association with God, in virtue of which He was always directly conscious of the divine will.

evident that they cannot be referred to an omnipotence which was His by nature, or to a miraculous endowment bestowed on Him for use at will (comp. vol. i. p. 335). They must be regarded as a divine endowment which He could mediate to the people, for from His baptism the divine miraculous aid had stood at His disposal (John i. 52). For this reason, many of these cases must be divine miracles in the strictest sense; they are certainly so where the convalescent was not on the spot, as in the cases of the centurion's son, and the daughter of the Canaanitish woman, and of those who were raised from the dead. We have seen already, that even in regard to the casting out of devils a really divine operation must be assumed (comp. vol. ii. p. 86); and this must also be the case with those cures, such as the healing of the paralysed, which seem most to admit of a psychological explanation. Not in the oldest source alone (Matt. ix. 6), but also in Mark (iii. 5) and John (v. 8), it is at a simple command from Jesus that the sick man receives back his full strength, or the use of the palsied limb. However much may be made of the mental impression produced by such words, it is impossible to conceive of the transference of that impression to the nervous system of the patient as a simple physiological process, the course of which is only conditioned by the energy of the original impulse. At all events Jesus did not so apprehend it, for in regard to the first of these cases He argues for an analogous divine power from the divine authority, bestowed for the purpose of enabling Him to give this command. But if He had need of an express divine authority, was He not certain that only God's miraculous power could through His word restore the paralysed nervous system of the sick man? As with the cures of those possessed by devils, so with the sick of the palsy, this divine operation depended on Jesus' word, and was therefore not entirely independent. In the degree, however, in which our sources show most distinctly that the cures were not disjoined occurrences in Jesus' life, but that His fixed calling was to cure as well as to teach, it is extremely improbable that a direct interference by God took place in every case of the kind, or that that divine operation may not have been produced in a distinct manner, corre-

sponding to, and therefore connected with, the work of His calling.

The constitution of our sources undoubtedly opposes peculiar difficulties to a minuter insight into the usual method of procedure. It is the oldest source more particularly that, agreeably to its purpose, directed its attention in the case of accounts of healing chiefly to specially important words uttered by Jesus on these occasions, seeking thereby to demonstrate the immediate commencement of the cure. However sketchy, and indeed often fragmentary, its treatment of details may be, which have no direct bearing on this purpose, we must not therefore expect a detailed representation of the progress of the cures. Mark alone tells of two cases which, since their insertion is not exactly explicable from his pragmatic point of view, can only have been described with such minuteness because he wished to represent Jesus' course of procedure, and therefore they must be regarded as representative of the way in which Peter described such cures (Mark vii. 32–36, viii. 22–26). For this reason the number of actual cures is strikingly small; and since there are among them four cases of blindness and two of leprosy, our knowledge of the diseases so acted upon is exceedingly limited.[1] Even if the general descriptions in the Gospel (Matt. iv. 24, xv. 30) are not applicable beyond the circle of which tradition gave precise examples, that is only

[1] Besides the cures already mentioned, the oldest source contains only the healing of the leper (Matt. viii.) and the cure of the two blind men (Matt. ix.), of the man afflicted with dropsy (Luke xiv.) and of the epileptic (Matt. xvii.). The last of these offers us no point of contact for inferring the progress of the cure, for even the first evangelist has accepted Mark's idea of its being the casting out of a devil, a conception which, as we shall see, cannot have been contained in the oldest source. It holds good only in regard to John that the cures narrated are those having a special significance for the pragmatism of his narrative; and yet even in his case the only addition to those already mentioned is the cure of the man born blind (John ix.). From the source peculiar to himself Luke has taken nothing but the account of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii.), along with that of the ten lepers (Luke xvii.). And even Mark, who is usually so ready to complete his narratives, has in general added very few details important for our question, to the narratives he incorporates from the oldest source. Besides the already mentioned cures of a deaf mute and a blind man (Mark vii. 8), he relates independently only the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (chap. i.) and of the blind man near Jericho (chap. x.), both of which have in their position a special significance.

an indication of how closely our evangelists have kept to the related facts. In no case, however, can it be inferred that isolated incidents only are treated of, for it is indelibly imprinted upon our tradition that Jesus regarded healing as the true business of His calling. In order that we may not misunderstand such a sensible want in our evangelical tradition, we must consider that miraculous cures were not confined to the time of Jesus, but were known as well in the apostolic age, which saw the rise of our tradition (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Rom. xv. 19; Jas. v. 14 f., and the cures in the Acts of the Apostles), and that the evangelists therefore only took such instances of the kind into consideration as possessed some special interest.

Notwithstanding this, fragmentary tradition brings us face to face with the fact, that with very unimportant exceptions, which need scarcely be considered, Jesus in curing either touched the sufferer or laid His hand upon him (comp. Matt. viii. 3, 9, 29; Luke xiii. 13, xiv. 4; Mark i. 31, vii. 33, viii. 23, 25; John ix. 6). And those exceptions are entirely outweighed by the descriptions usually given of Jesus' ministry of healing, in which the evangelists never omit to mention this laying on of the hand (Mark vi. 5; Luke iv. 40), and by the fact that those who sought aid expected something of the kind (Mark v. 23, vii. 32, viii. 22). This idea of this touch being nothing but a symbolic representation of the communication of divine blessing is in certain cases precluded by the repetition of the act, and in itself is as far from being probable as the assumption that Jesus, in a pedagogic way, only made faith somewhat easier to the sick, while pointing at the same time to the source of the cure. The act itself can certainly not be regarded as referring to more extensive manipulations which Jesus employed in truly medical fashion, and of which tradition had retained only those slight traces; for although the complaints of Sabbath desecration, which were raised against His cures, show indubitably that Jesus did not usually effect them through a single word, yet the mere touch of His hand gave grounds for His being accused of profanation by the censors of that day, with their lifelessly literal apprehension of the law regarding the Sabbath. If,

then, this strange course of procedure is not to be left absolutely unexplained, or if it is to be regarded as a perfectly indifferent external form, it must necessarily be conceded that Jesus possessed a corporeal gift of healing, which these contacts made effectual.[1] The ultimate cause can only be found in the unique character of His person, and—as this consisted more especially in His perfect sinlessness—in a forcibleness inherent in His corporeal organism, and resting on the unconditioned sway His spirit wielded over His body, enabling Him to convey by a touch to others the health that was peculiarly His own. This ability was the special endowment by which the divinely miraculous operation took a place in Jesus' ordinary work of healing.

At the same time, it must not be overlooked that we cannot conceive of the majority of Jesus' cures as being other than momentary effects produced by His touch, which, although the result was manifestly certain, only began a healing process that was completed in a perfectly natural way when once the power of recovery had been supernaturally communicated. The account of cures contained in the oldest source is the one least calculated to exhibit the different steps of the process, its only intention being to show the infallible result of Jesus' early ministry of healing. And yet even in it there is confirmation of this in the healing of the lepers and the blind men.[2] Only in this way can any explanation be offered of Jesus' employment of outward means. There has been in some quarters an inclination to dispute this fact, and sport has been made of these pretended

[1] This assumption, to which our sources necessarily lead, has been brought into disrepute by Weisse comparing it with the purely natural powers of animal magnetism, and by his employing it in many other strange combinations.

[2] Jesus' energetic dismissal of the cured leper is a striking proof that perfect recovery had not been conveyed by the health-bringing touch, but that the process of cure had now begun which made the danger of infection the greater; and even in Luke's account of the healing of the lepers, which is so sketchy that the healing touch is not once referred to, it is expressly said that the sick men only became actually clean while on their way to Jerusalem (xvii. 14), *i.e.* that the acute eruption was only cured by degrees. Even in Mark viii. 23 f. it is manifestly apparent that Jesus Himself expected nothing but a gradual restoration of the power of sight; and in John ix. 7, He promised it only after the man had washed in the pool of Siloam.

medicaments. Others, again, have seen in it the more magical and mysterious conception of miracles held by the later evangelists. It is, however, not only attested by Mark, the oldest of our synoptic Gospels, being mentioned there in the two narratives which are narrated in detail, but also by John in his one descriptive story of healing. Notwithstanding this, it is extremely hazardous to assume that such means were regularly employed by Jesus, for of the three cases mentioned two treat of the healing of blind men (Mark viii. 23; John ix. 6), and the third of the unloosening of a mute's tongue (Mark vii. 33).[1] In these three cases Jesus employed saliva, whose curative power was known to the ancients, and which, especially in cases of eye disease, was undoubtedly used by the Rabbis of that time. But neither could the restoration of the power of vision nor the removal of the impediment in speech be expected from its use, particularly as the real cure is ascribed by Mark to the touch of the hand, and to that alone (vii. 33, viii. 23). The general idea that Jesus employed natural means as the carriers or conductors, as it were, of His miraculous power may be contradicted entirely. But it is a very different thing if the miraculous effect was produced by the touch of Jesus' hand, for this could only be operative by reason of Jesus' possession of a supernatural gift of healing. The supposition of the miraculous assistance having in some cases required the aid of a natural medium, either destroys its character as miraculous help or else reduces it to a mere pædagogic support to faith. The actual employment of natural means rather presupposes that they would take effect according to the natural order of things. Nothing is left then but the assumption that the natural healing process, brought about by a momentary operation of the miraculous, must somehow have been assisted in a natural way by this outward means. This comes out most clearly where Jesus makes clay of spittle and anoints the eyes of the blind, after that, however, bidding him wash in the pool of Siloam, when, and not till

[1] It cannot be proved that Jesus ever anointed with oil, which He seems to have recommended His disciples to do, according to Mark vi. 13; and we have no justification for referring to the course of cure pursued by the Essenes and the Rabbis.

when, the cure began (John ix. 6 f.). It is manifest in this case that the healing process began when the eye was touched; and, aided by the application of saliva, it needed a certain time for its consummation, which was covered by sending the blind man to the pool.[1]

Little as we know about Jesus' course of procedure, it is clear from what is told us that it involved particular attention to the sufferers individually. Exception has been taken, and with justification, to the cures nominally performed by Jesus in the mass, and suspicion has been aroused that the descriptions of our evangelists must be founded upon excessive exaggerations. This has chiefly been owing to the surprise felt that, notwithstanding these cures, so many should constantly present themselves seeking help, although, as we shall see, Jesus laboured long in a comparatively limited sphere. But these evangelists say nothing about cures *en masse*, at least Mark does not, from whom all these descriptions are taken; but they speak of the conflux of people seeking help, as coming often from a far distance. Even on that first evening in the house of Simon, those who had come together were by no

[1] Some have made the mistake of reckoning an isolation of the patient among the means used by Jesus in His cures, regarding it either as necessary for the cure or requisite for the didactic purpose (comp. Mark vii. 33, viii. 23). In both instances Jesus makes known His wish that there should be no further announcement of the cure (Mark vii. 36, viii. 26), just as Mark had already shown (Mark i. 44, v. 43; comp. besides Matt. ix. 30). This, of course, is not to be, with Renan, understood as if Jesus, who entered with reluctance upon this thaumaturgic confusion, could not think of it without disgust, and was put out when He heard it spoken of. In reality Mark only intends to make it evident how Jesus did not act as a mountebank might do, but how He tried everything that could prevent His becoming renowned as a worker of miracles, by reason of His cures, although the popular enthusiasm would thereby have been increased. This was what the first evangelist understood, so much so indeed that he recognised in it the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (xlii. 2; Matt. xii. 16–19). But even this conception cannot be correct, since Mark himself lays special emphasis on the fact of these prohibitions being of no avail (i. 45, vii. 36; comp. Luke v. 15; Matt. ix. 31), a certainty which Jesus must have foreseen, particularly as the most of His miracles of healing were done in the sight of a great multitude, where indeed such a prohibition served no purpose, and where He occasionally enjoined the very opposite (Mark v. 19). We shall see later, however, that these interdictions had either a particular reason (Matt. viii. 4; Mark v. 43), or else they belong to that later period when Jesus had retired from His popular activity, and particularly desired that the benefits He bestowed on individuals should not bring fresh claims on His healing activity (Mark vii. 36, viii. 26).

means all healed (Mark i. 34; comp. ver. 37). It is neither said that His healing power did not suffice for all, nor that some did not prove themselves worthy, but that in the short evening hour there was not time to attend to every case. We usually hear, besides, of Jesus being so busied with healing as to do without nourishment (Mark iii. 20, vi. 31), although the traces of bodily fatigue or even of exhaustion, supposed to exist, are probably imaginary. But even this presupposes particular attention to the individual, whether or not it was the ascertaining of his faith, the inquiry into his suffering, and the determining if and in what way Jesus might afford aid. From all we can gather from our sources, it is evident that the proffered help varied in the different cases.

If healing the sick formed part of Jesus' calling, there must have been some connection between that and His Messianic destiny. Assuredly, however, the connection was not what is generally supposed. It is an old idea that the people looked for miracles from the Messiah, and therefore that the power of working miracles was, as is usually said, the historical condition of His recognition.[1] It has even been conjectured that experience of His miraculous endowment assisted Jesus in attaining to certainty of His Messianic calling. But it is impossible, however, that miracles in general, and cures in particular, could have been regarded by the people as a sign of Jesus' miraculous destiny. For, according to Old Testament tradition, the prophets and other men of God had frequently performed miracles of the very same character; and they had never been regarded as indispensably requisite for attesting the prophet's mission, as is shown by the universal recognition of the Baptist, who did no miracles (John x. 41).

[1] We know indeed from all our sources that a sign in attestation of His Messiahship was demanded from Jesus (Matt. xii. 38; Mark viii. 11; John vi. 30); and from the fact of His refusing it, it has been supposed our Gospels preserved the naive recollection that in truth He wrought no miracles. Deceived by a profound way of speaking, customary to John, it has been overlooked that not even one miracle is in question here, and much less can it be miracles of healing in general. Jesus' miracles are nowhere called signs in the older sources, but everywhere mighty works (Matt. xi. 20, 21, 23; Mark vi. 2, 5, 14; Luke xix. 37). Every sign, however, which was demanded as a proof of His Messianic destiny is expressly characterized as a sign from heaven both in Mark and in the oldest source, and even in John's example it appears as at least differing absolutely in character from the healing of those who were sick.

The one thing these miracles could show was that God was with Jesus (John iii. 2), hearing His prayer (ix. 31, xi. 22), and working in and through Him (xiv. 10 f.); they were in so far, therefore, attestations of His divine mission (iii. 2, ix. 33; comp. v. 36), and of the power bestowed upon Him in virtue of it (Matt. ix. 6), which strengthened the authority of His preaching of repentance (Matt. xi. 21, 23). But they would never prove directly that His mission was Messianic. The mighty acts which He performed, especially the casting out of devils, might well cause the people to ask whether He whom Jehovah permitted to do so much, would also accomplish the greatest task of all; this might have led to His Messianic destiny being inferred (Matt. xii. 23). When more or less directly He described His destiny as being Messianic, it might easily be concluded from His miracles that He was no liar, or God would otherwise have withheld assistance from Him (John x. 25, 38, xv. 24). But we know why it was that at the commencement of His activity at least Jesus did not make a frank confession of His Messiahship.[1] And then, too, miracles of knowledge and of power did no more than prove that He was a prophet (Luke vii. 16; John iv. 19, ix. 17) sent by God (John xi. 42). It was certainly believed that the prophets had prophesied of miracles to be wrought by the Messiah, and of miracles of healing in particular, and this expectation is regarded by Strauss as having been so established as partially to account for some of Jesus' cures, while the remainder must be imputed to tradition. But when asked where this prophecy is to be found, he refers, since there is no question as to the figurative character of passages such as Isa. xxix. 18, xlii. 7, constantly to Isa. xxxv. 5 f., a passage which seems almost to have formed the programme for the whole of the Messiah's miraculous activity. It is perfectly true that by means of an ingenious interpretation Jesus saw this passage fulfilled in that part of His ministry which was devoted to the performance of miracles (Matt. xi. 5).

[1] The question whether the Messiah, when He came, might possibly perform greater signs, could only arise at a period when there was no longer any doubt as to His Messianic claims, and when the people must have accustomed themselves to give up the signs which could alone have attested His Messiahship (John vii. 31).

But neither from that nor from some Rabbinical passages of uncertain date can it be shown that before His time miracles were expected from the Messiah on the ground of this text; indeed, such a view is contrary to its entire spirit.[1] But how few the direct prophecies in the Old Testament were, which seemed to that age to bear upon the Messiah's activity, is indubitably clear from the way in which the first evangelist, although so learned in the Scriptures, when desiring to prove that Jesus' ministry was foretold by the prophets, seizes upon the prophecy of the sin-bearing servant (Isa. liii. 4; Matt. viii. 17), which in its original sense refers to anything rather than the healing of the sick.

Even in that indirect sense, however, Jesus' miracles of healing cannot have been performed in order to produce or to strengthen belief in His Messiahship. There is a warning even in the Old Testament against believing in a prophet because of his miracles (Deut. xiii. 2 ff.), and the evangelists represent Jesus as speaking of false prophets who would perform signs and wonders (Mark xiii. 22). Besides this, the fact is evident that in spite of all His miracles, the people did not ultimately believe (John xii. 37), and that the adversaries of Jesus defamed the greatest of His mighty acts as being works of the devil (Matt. xii. 24). On this very account, therefore, Jesus could put no value upon a faith resting on the sensuous impression produced by His miracles (John ii. 23 f., iv. 48). For the objections taken to them, or even the non-fulfilment of the hopes always associated with the Messiah, might lead this belief astray, or transform it into animosity. It was for this reason that Jesus made it so abundantly clear, even when Himself appealing to His miracles, that He only regarded them as accessories (John xiv. 11, 15, 24), and that the faith He looked for was faith in His word. It is impossible, however, that such an essential part of His ministry was nothing but a pretext. That would necessitate the giving up of any connection between His healing activity and His true calling, and

[1] Besides this, the question is insoluble why the other miracles directly connected with it (Isa. xxxv. 7–9) were not also expected from the Messiah. Would Jesus really have given no answer to the Baptist's question if He might have assumed that John in any way apprehended the saying of the prophet as referring to the cures wrought by the Messiah?

111701

the referring of them to His love for the people, and His compassion for their need. However beautiful it appears in its humanity, we have seen how impossible it was that this could be, for Jesus was only able to perform miracles when God bid Him do so, and therefore His miracles of healing must necessarily have belonged to the ministry of His calling to which God directed Him.

In truth, however, they formed a most essential part of this ministry. The entirely unhistorical view must be given up of the Messiah being really nothing more than a religio-ethical reformer. He is nowhere represented as such in Old Testament prophecy, and therefore Jesus cannot have regarded His Messianic calling in this light. The ultimate aim of the Messianic activity never varied from being the re-formation of the nation's life as a whole, the healing of all its miseries, the satisfaction of its needs, and the bringing about of the most ample salvation and blessing even as regards its external existence. We have seen how Jesus made the fulfilment of this side of His Messianic calling dependent upon the consummation of the theocracy in the spiritual sense; for the complete national life this part of the Messianic salvation continued to lie in the future, indeed to be hypothetical. But in the life of the individual it might commence at once, for there, as we have seen, only the one condition of faith was necessary. By those miracles of healing, Jesus, by helping, blessing, and saving, desired to exercise an influence even upon the outward life of the individual, healing his sores and removing his troubles. Nothing, however, weighed more on His heart than healing the misery of sickness. Distinctly as Jesus resisted the conception of each illness being the result of a definite sin (John ix. 3), He recognised by words (John v. 14) and deeds (Matt. ix. 2) the profound connection existing between the wretchedness of sickness and that of sin; indeed this connection was very evident in the case of those possessed by devils, among whom the most powerful of His mighty works were done (comp. vol. ii. p. 81). The Great Physician of sin (Mark ii. 17) had therefore to be a physician to the body also, in order to show how the welfare He mediated embraced both the mind and body. His ministry of healing became a great sermon in deeds on the divine power which had

actually appeared on earth, saving, healing, and blessing, and on the nearing dawn of the Messianic age, which would bring with it the restoration of the national life, and every blessing on the people themselves. It was in this sense that Jesus, by referring to Isaiah (xxxv. 5 f.), mentioned His miracles of healing as signs of that approaching era (Matt. xi. 5). No one has recognised this more distinctly than the fourth evangelist, and therefore Jesus' miracles in general, and His miracles of healing in particular, he always calls signs.[1]

The short evening hour passed, which Jesus was able to devote to the sick; He remained for the night in Simon's house. Day had not yet dawned, however, when He quitted the dwelling and withdrew to the solitude of a desert place in the neighbourhood of the city, there to be alone with His God during the early morning hour. He knew that those who had not been cured the evening before would scarcely wait for break of day to return in search of aid. It happened just as He had foreseen; Simon and his comrades were impelled to set out immediately, and rested not until they found Him. They announced that these petitioners were gathering in throngs, and evidently expected Him to accompany them back at once, that He might satisfy their demands. But Jesus explained to them that He had not come to sojourn always in one place, that His early departure was to prevent the possibility of His being detained there, and that He had also to preach in the neighbouring towns (Mark i. 35–38). It is only necessary to read this scene as probably often described by

[1] John undoubtedly went a step farther still. Of all the miracles of healing, he treated the cures of the blind and the raising of Lazarus in greatest detail, because, as it happened, words which Jesus had uttered on those occasions might be taken in the one case as a symbol of His enlightening ministry (John ix. 5, 39), in the other, as a symbol of His life-creating activity (xi. 25), making it possible to understand how in a spiritual sense Jesus regarded the miraculous feeding of the multitude as a sign of His bringing the people true spiritual nourishment (vi. 27). Probably John saw in all Jesus' acts of healing corporeal symbols of what He desired to carry out in the spiritual life of the people, and which were meant as a hint to the still sensually inclined people of His high spiritual design. These signs would only be understood, however, as meaning what had long ago been taught by history, that that external blessing had not been and could not be attained, owing to the guilt of the nation. This ministry of healing, however, was not merely a symbol, but was in truth a beginning to the age of salvation, which was to bring about the hoped-for consummation of the exterior life of the nation

Peter, when telling of Jesus' first visit to his home, to be absolutely certain that Jesus did not live in Capernaum, as has been generally supposed. The impression made by His first appearance there, the manner in which the crowd, so soon as Sabbath permitted, sought to discover His presence for the sake of their sick, the haste with which they sought for Him in early morning, so that the great worker of miracles should not escape without their reaping some benefit, and finally, Jesus' express declaration,—all this leaves no doubt on the matter. Certainly we see from Mark that Jesus returned again and again to Capernaum (Mark ii. 1, ix. 33); and it is evident that this place is frequently intended when none is definitely named. It was this town, then, where His first four disciples dwelt, which was chosen by Jesus as the central point of His ministry; and the house so often spoken of (Mark ii. 1, iii. 19, vii. 17, ix. 33) is evidently either Simon's or that of the two sons of Zebedee.[1] Mark concludes the account of Jesus' first visit there during His public life with the declaration that it was only a visit.

Such was the commencement of Jesus' wandering life in Galilee.

[1] What Jesus says in the oldest source (Matt. xi. 23), as well as in Luke (iv. 23), is confirmatory of His having given the preference to Capernaum; and even in John vi. 24 it is clearly assumed that He was always sought for there first of all. The first evangelist draws an inference from this that Jesus formally removed from Nazareth to Capernaum, and continued to reside there, in which fact he even sees the fulfilment of a prophetical passage announcing the rising of the Sun of salvation upon the north, with its Gentile population (Matt. iv. 13-16; comp. Isa. viii. 23, ix. 1); he therefore calls the town *His town* (ix. 1), and always regards the house which Jesus there inhabited as having been His own house (ix. 28, xiii. 1, 36, xvii. 25), and yet the first of those passages (ix. 10) shows that the narrative from Mark on which it rests does not mean a house belonging to Jesus. Vain attempts have been made to introduce harmoniously this idea of the evangelist's into Luke iv. 31, or John ii. 12, where there is nothing answering to it. None of our sources know of any dwelling which Jesus had in Capernaum, indeed the oldest apostolic source represents Him as laying emphasis upon His homelessness and the unsettledness of His life, though in a way that does not preclude the possibility of its having been the case (Matt. viii. 20). Moreover, although it is not mentioned in the Old Testament, the place whose name signifies "the village of Nahum," transformed in our present Greek text into Capernaum, cannot have been quite unimportant, since it possessed both a garrison and a synagogue (Luke vii. 1-5). The usual supposition that it was also a place for gathering customs is, according to Mark ii. 13 f., very improbable.

# CHAPTER VIII.

## BY THE LAKE OF GENNESARETH.

IN a hollow of the Jordan valley, on the eastern boundary of the province of Galilee, lies the Lake of Gennesareth (Luke v. 1), most frequently referred to in our sources as the Sea of Galilee (Mark i. 16, vii. 31), and only by John called the Lake of Tiberias, after the capital on the western shore (vi. 1, xxi. 1). It is from thirteen to sixteen miles long and about half as wide, in form a regular oval, only that the north-west side forms a bay the margin of which is about seven miles in extent. It is traversed from north to south by the Jordan, the valley-basin of which breaks through the hills at its points of entrance and exit; its water is clear, and well stocked with fish. On the west and south the steep hills, with their dark basalt walls, pierced only by narrow defiles, and reaching to a height of from eight hundred to a thousand feet, approach close to the lake; towards the north-west they are only half the height, belong to the chalk formation, and descend gradually in terraces to the shore. On the western shore the narrow margin widens out to the breadth of a mile, while towards the north there stretches a plain three miles wide, enclosed by hills arranged in the form of a semicircle, well watered, and once upon a time studded by towns and villages. It is this plain, called in Mark the land of Gennesareth (vi. 53, 55), which Josephus extols in the most unmeasured terms for the mildness of its climate, its beauty, and its fruitfulness.[1] At one time the lake was enlivened with fishing-craft and surrounded by flourishing districts; in the winter months, at which season the events recorded here took place, the heat, which in summer is often suffocating, is abated in the hollow; the brow of the hills, generally so bare, is clothed with green, and above the lake stretches the

[1] Comp. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10. 8.

deep blue sky, against which on the north the snow-capped peak of Hermon is drawn in white outline.

It is this ever charming region, which, at least in Palestine, was without its equal, that we must think of as the scene of Jesus' earlier ministry. Mark is certainly incorrect in representing Him as, from the first, travelling over the whole province (i. 39). While His headquarters were at Capernaum, it appears that, at least in the earlier period, His travels did, with one expressly mentioned exception, scarcely extend beyond the north-western shore of the lake and the plain of Gennesareth. It would otherwise be incomprehensible how it was that, at the busiest moments of His Galilean ministry, He felt it necessary to send His disciples to the various districts of the province (Mark vi. 7). At the southern end of the plain of Gennesareth, three miles north of Tiberias, a place which Jesus appears to have intentionally shunned, lay Magdala, giving name to one of His most devoted followers; Chorazin and Bethsaida, too, in which most of His miracles were performed, were certainly situated in this neighbourhood. It is much to be regretted, for the sake of the clearness of many incidents, especially those occurring in the critical days of Jesus' ministry, that the position of Bethsaida (fisher-houses) and Capernaum is not yet perfectly ascertained. Some seek the first-named in the Khan Minyeh of the present day, lying on the northern boundary of the plain of Gennesareth, where the hills which close on the lake shut it in, and where the road by the lake is obliged to wind up and almost through the rocks; others regard it as being Capernaum itself, so that Bethsaida must have been situated farther north. It is very probable, however, that Capernaum was at least three miles northward from Khan Minyeh (Bethsaida), and somewhere near the ruins of Tell Hum, lying about two miles from where the Jordan enters the lake, at the spot where the coast line bends towards the west.[1] Chorazin, on the other hand, is now generally regarded as having been situated where the ruins of

[1] The arguments for and against, borrowed from Old Testament statements, are not unfrequently grounded upon conceptions of a very dubious character; from the way in which Mark introduces the plain of Gennesareth in chap. vi. 53, it appears to me highly improbable that the Capernaum so often mentioned was situated there; even John vi. 17, 21 seems to tell against this (comp. Book v. chap. 2). Josephus' statement about the homonymous fountains does not

Kerazeh are found, in a lateral valley some mile and a half north-west of Tell Hum. The whole extent, therefore, of the district within which Jesus' journeyings were confined was about fifteen miles, though this certainly did not include excursions into the country lying behind the north-western shore.

The more concentrated Jesus' ministry was shown to be, the greater would be the enthusiasm of the people for Him, and the more would the throng surrounding Him increase. At one time they came to bring their sick, at another to hear the mighty words which fell from the great man. The more the hope of His being the expected One, who should prepare the salvation promised by Jehovah, got a hold upon the people, so much the more did they crowd together, waiting for the hour when He should speak the mighty word that promised the fulfilment of all their hopes. When He tarried in the city for a time, we find that the throng so encompassed the house where He abode, that no one could get across the threshold (Mark ii. 2; comp. i. 33); when He returned from an excursion, the multitude were already awaiting Him (Mark v. 21; comp. Luke viii. 40), and He could not pass through the narrow streets of the city without being surrounded by a crowd (Mark v. 24). We learn that even at an early date He was obliged to avoid the towns on account of the conflux of people, and that He sought out desert places in which, however, He was ultimately discovered (Mark i. 45). A favourite retreat of His was by the shore of the lake (ii. 13, iii. 7); but even there the people thronged around Him. This was probably the reason why He made provision for having a fishing-boat at His disposal (iii. 9), from which He addressed the people assembled on the shore (Mark iv. 1; comp. Luke v. 1–3). Sometimes He retired to the mountain (Matt. v. 1), seating Himself upon some elevated point while the multitude was encamped upon the level ground around (Luke vi. 17). It is an ancient error to suppose that our Gospels anywhere speak of

actually suit either locality; the reports of ancient travellers testify to a tradition which is of no great value, and the meaning of the names is very uncertain. Now that ruins have also been discovered at Khan Minyeh, there is no longer any possibility of settling the question definitively, as might have been expected from the exploration of the country which is now in progress.

one hill in particular on which He taught; in all cases the mountain summit is placed in opposition to the sea-shore (Mark iii. 13; Matt. xv. 29). Here Jesus began His true ministry as a teacher of the people. In the synagogue He was bound to a definite text, although free exhortations or instructions were conjoined with it. But here His peculiar method of addressing the people could be exhibited most freely.

Of these popular addresses of Jesus we can form a more distinct conception than of the sermons preached in the synagogues.[1] It is involved, indeed, in the nature of the case, that certain points in the speeches were peculiarly impressed upon tradition, especially those which were striking in expression, either the gnomic and symbolic, or those showing paradox and hyperbole. It is indisputable, however, that besides sharing in the proverbial wisdom of the East, Jesus' popular speeches also took the peculiar shape with which we are acquainted from the Old Testament memorials. This is the gnomic form, in which each thought is rounded off concisely, leaving no cause for further amplification, and thus making it easy for the memory to retain it, indeed inducing it to do so. Quite in the Old Testament way the gnome readily takes the form of Hebrew parallelism (Matt. vii. 2), at one time antithetical (Luke xiv. 11), at another carrying forward the idea on a parallel line (Matt. x. 40), and yet again so presenting one part as an illustration of the other (Mark ii. 17), that in order to its apprehension, it is essential to perceive which side contains the real pith of the idea. A gnome is enlivened by a play upon words, sometimes by the same words being repeated in different meanings in the various sections (Matt. x. 39), at others by different phases of the idea being placed

[1] It is true the oldest source gives us only one of these,—that which possessed a peculiar interest for the primitive Church,—the so-called Sermon on the Mount; and it must be true even in regard to it, that in the first memoranda made by the ear-witness, which can yet be critically reconstructed from the two redactions occurring in our Gospels, what are really the principal points of the speech stand out with vivid distinctness, especially the solemn introduction and close. Perhaps the last great reproof of the leaders and heads of the people, as well as some other smaller speeches on special occasions, may have been preserved with considerable completeness. But although of the others only more or less extensive fragments are preserved, yet these are more than sufficient to make their peculiar method clear to us.

in relation to each other through the choice of a consonant expression (Matt. x. 32 f.). A special peculiarity in the gnomic form, however, is its giving one phase of an idea with great acuteness and force without adding the necessary precautions for its proper application (Matt. vii. 1); it does not consider the inevitable exceptions (Matt. x. 24), nor the precise circumstance in which the saying holds good, and which we can only guess at (Matt. xx. 16, xxv. 29). This is why it so often presents an appearance of one-sidedness (Matt. vii. 7 f.), of paradox (John ix. 39), of exaggeration (Matt. xii. 30; Mark ix. 46), and even of contradiction (comp. John v. 31 with viii. 14, iii. 17 with ix. 39). Out of these apothegms are formed collections of sayings which revolve round one principal idea, or have reference to one definite object. There is no continuous development of the thought, but saying is connected with saying; the logical connection, often only lightly indicated, must be guessed at from the relation of separate thoughts to one another and to the principal subject, for that was made necessary by the poverty of the Aramaic tongue. This is the explanation of the peculiar character of our tradition. Even ear-witnesses could not possibly keep in remembrance the original sequence of these sayings with absolute certainty or even consecutively. Each separate saying resembled a precious stone, which, shone on from different sides, sparkles with various colours; even when not in its original connection, it continued to be true and stood a new application, although here and there with an almost imperceptible change of setting. Even oral tradition was in the habit of making use of these apothegms, first in one way and then in another; at one time our evangelists learnt from it how to dissolve the traditionary groups of sayings and weave their elements together again, employing them particularly in enlarging the traditionary speeches,—a task at which the first evangelist was so peculiarly apt,—at another how to form new series of axioms, such as are presented by Mark (comp. iv. 21–25, ix. 33–50).[1]

[1] There is, of course, a possibility that Jesus may now and again have repeated one of these sayings and applied it differently; but when the apologetics, which boasts of its strict orthodoxy, attributes to Him the repetition of the same word and of whole sets of sayings four or five times, in order here and there to

It is the nature of a popular address to descend to the auditor's standpoint, but it dare not do so by accommodating itself to his errors. The supposition of there being such an accommodation in Jesus' addresses has frequently been the means, when the purport was no longer understood, of its being regarded as nothing but an idea belonging to the nation or the age, which Jesus appropriated in order to lead His hearers gradually to the truth. But even in this case the object did not justify the means. Any accommodation to error or untruth is as contrary to sound teaching as it is immoral, for it deprives the scholar of confidence in his teacher, and necessarily provokes his criticism. To distinguish between a negative and positive accommodation, or between one in form and one in matter, and to confess that one of these took place, is to make a most confused use of language. If Jesus did not busy Himself in explaining and improving the views of His contemporaries regarding historical, geographical, astronomical, and scientific subjects, it not only means that this was no task of His, but, moreover, that in respect of such matters, He possessed no higher knowledge than they did. At the beginning He kept back cautiously much that it was necessary for them to know—as, for example, in regard to acknowledging His Messiahship, and even on the evening before His death there was much He did not tell His disciples, simply because they could not bear them (John xvi. 12); but all this is nothing but the condescension of a true instructor, who measures what is to be communicated by the scholar's ability to understand. But the fact of everything not being said that might be, does not mean that either a half or whole falsehood has been uttered. Jesus did not combat the sensuous ideas of the nation regarding the kingdom of God, making it thereby evident that He saw in them a germ of truth. He was aware that the destruction of the mistaken form ought not to be begun until there was ability

improve on a single word, by so doing it has in honour of the literality of our tradition thrown on Jesus the suspicion of a striking poverty in ideas. It is true, indeed, that with very petty exceptions, the original resting-place of the greater number of these erratic masses can even now be fixed, and their new application can yet be proved in the changes which had become necessary; in many cases their historical relations are first made clear by going back upon the oldest form of these sayings and series of sayings.

to discover the right. When He taught how that germ was to be correctly apprehended,—to which end indeed His endeavours were entirely directed,—the false conceptions crumbled away of themselves. There is, however, a constant inclination to accredit Him with having clothed in the garb of these sensuous conceptions some sublime ideas which were totally alien to His age; but if so, then history would long ago have charged Him with an inexcusable want of acquaintance with the first principles of education; it teaches how eighteen hundred years passed before His intention was perceived.

Jesus undoubtedly condescended to accept the popular ways of thinking and speaking, for He presents the abstract by the concrete. Like a true son of the East, however, He was scarcely able to think in abstract terms. His conceptions were of the most lifelike description. Everything general is abstract, the concrete is only the individual appearance in which the universal is represented. Jesus did not speak of temporal anxieties in general, but of anxious thought for food and clothing (Matt. vi. 25); not of ordinary demonstrations of affection, but of salutations, and lending, and the drink of cold water bestowed by one man upon another (Matt. v. 47; Luke vi. 34; Matt. x. 42; comp. Matt. xxv. 35 f.); neither did He speak about men who were on an equality as regards temporal things, but He mentioned those who laboured on the same field and ground at the one mill (Matt. xxiv. 40 f.). He did not allude to the members of a family, but He counted them up—father and son, mother and daughter, daughter-in-law and mother-in-law (Matt. x. 35 f.). Each quality is an abstraction, but Jesus represented it through some individuality by which it was manifested. He did not talk of the uncertainty of human possessions, but of the treasures which moth and rust do consume, and for which thieves dig through that they may steal (Matt. vi. 19); not of effeminate men, but of men in soft clothing (Matt. xi. 8); instead of things the most costly and indispensable, He mentioned the pearls which people have in their possession—the eyes and hands which are so constantly made use of (Matt. vii. 6, v. 29 f.). He described the most immutable of all things by the gates of Hades which open to

no one behind whom they have once closed (Matt. xvi. 18), and the most frightful of endings through drowning with a millstone round the neck (Matt. xviii. 6). The more striking the individual conception which He brought forward, the more vividly is the view presented; the more unattainable it is in actuality, the more certainly does it demonstrate that it is nothing but the expression of a universal idea. Jesus undoubtedly made frequent use of expressions which had almost passed into proverbs. What was an impossibility according to human standards, was described by the camel that passes through the needle's eye (Matt. xix. 24); the possibility of the apparently impossible, by the crying of stones and the moving of mountains (Luke xix. 40; Matt. xvii. 20). He spoke of the beam and the mote in the eye (Matt. vii. 3), of those who strained out a gnat and swallowed a camel (Matt. xxiii. 24), of the devouring of widows' houses (Mark xii. 40), and the giving of alms so that the right hand should not know what was done by the left (Matt. vi. 3). In this way His addresses came to have something of an hyperbolical character, for He mentioned the most external form in which the universal order was represented. He did not speak of conflict and discord, but at once of the sword which puts an end to existence (Matt. x. 34), and He bade His disciples proclaim the gospel from the house-tops (Matt. x. 27). He spoke of the hairs of our heads as being counted (Matt. x. 30), and contrasted fasting with a funereal countenance with the fasting when one anoints oneself for a feast (Matt. vi. 16 f.).[1]

This peculiarity in Jesus' addresses is often treated of unwittingly under the title of imagery. But although the form taken by His speeches may give rise to an ideal picture, yet that is not imagery, for it does not necessitate any transference

[1] In this case, too, the rule is applicable that the single idea can never be pursued beyond the bounds of the general conception in the exemplification of which it is employed. Prayer in one's chamber does not exclude public prayer when that is done without ostentation, as in Matt. vi. 6. The removal of the eye and the hand (Matt. v. 29 f.) is as far from being meant literally as what is said about personal mutilation (Matt. xix. 12). It was not a single imposing title which Jesus forbade (Matt. xxiii. 8–10), but He reprehended the high-flown passion for titles; there was no prohibition of some one opprobrious or abusive word (Matt. v. 22), but of any expression of angry feeling.

to another sphere, but gives visibility to the conception which it directly represents. There is visibility in the metaphor as well, but it requires that the conception which has been aroused in the lowly domain of sensuous existence should be transferred to the more elevated spiritual sphere. Real similitudes are of comparatively rare occurrence, but of these the parallels drawn between the Pharisees and the whited sepulchres (Matt. xxiii. 27 f.), and between the people and the wilful children (xi. 16 f.), are examples. The metaphor is with Jesus never a mere figure of speech, or a poetic touch which shall lend His language a higher strain; true allegory, in which the metaphorical language becomes a work of art, is, with very slight exceptions (Matt. xii. 43–45; comp. vol. ii. p. 80), utterly unknown to Him. At this point His popular teaching formally begins; He connects what He has to say with what is well known, with what the sensuously inclined people are directly conversant. It was now that Jesus opened the great book of nature and human existence in order to interpret it as He had once done in the synagogue with the book of the Old Testament. But this other book as well contains a directly divine revelation. God's all-embracing bounty is revealed in the rain and sunshine which nourish and warm (Matt. vi. 45); His providence feeds the birds of heaven, and preserves them in life (vi. 26, x. 29); it clothes the lilies of the field more splendidly than ever Solomon was arrayed (vi. 28 f.). But in all this there is nothing figurative, or only in so far as the flower's beauty and colouring are termed its garment. It is not this, however, to which it refers, but to the revelation of God in nature, which is real, not figurative. Instead of for ever admiring these words, which after all contain nothing but the elements of all religion, we have more reason to be surprised at their scantiness. The reason for this simply being that Jesus found in the book of nature and human existence a still more profound revelation of God, which He first expounded in His symbolic and parabolic speech. His figures have many a time a bearing on His circumstances at the moment; by the well He spoke of living water (John iv. 10, 14); in view of the green corn-fields, of the great harvest which was in store (iv. 36); beside the fisherman's bark, of catching

men (Mark i. 17); and when referring to the prophet at the Jordan, He talked of the reed which grows on the shore (Matt. xi. 7). Many such references, however, which it is supposed have been discovered, are mere toys of the exegetes. Jesus had no need for these connections, He drew from the ultimate source. Neither is it now necessary for us to refer to some of His figures when we would get a clear idea of His *symbolic* manner of teaching; we, too, draw from the sources.

All the conceptions taken from the sphere of bodily sensuous existence Jesus makes emblems of spiritual states and actions. There is such a thing as spiritual hearing and deafness, blindness and vision, poverty and riches. There is a spiritual hungering and thirsting, eating and drinking, seeking and knocking; a spiritual condition of health and sickness, a spiritual birth and childhood, life and death. Since, however, our corporeally sensuous existence connects us with the surrounding world, so the former becomes an emblem of the spiritual existence which moves in a world of spiritual possessions and forces. The contrast between light and darkness corresponds to spiritual vision; salt and leaven, as well as the bread of life and the living water, answer to spiritual eating and drinking. In the Lord's Supper the bread and wine become an emblem of the greatest of all gifts, and the blessed condition beyond the grave is represented as a great feast. Even suffering is represented as a vessel from which man has to drink, or as a cross he has to bear. The treasures in heaven answer to poverty and riches, the easy yoke of Jesus to the heavy burdens of the Pharisees. Above is the paternal home and the everlasting mansions; they can be opened and shut, and it is possible to enter in, but strait is the gate and narrow the way. God's world, in its length and breadth, becomes an emblem—the sun which shines from heaven and the lightning which comes down to earth, the fire which once lighted devours unceasingly, the rock is an emblem of constancy, and the reed a figure of indecision. Even the symbolism of animal life is seen in the wisdom of the serpents and the simplicity of the doves, in the defenceless sheep and the ravening wolves, in the hen which gathers her chickens under her wings. Symbolic language is customary in the East, but Jesus would not

have employed it to such an extent if He had not had a profound object in view. All religious life dies when, separated from the rest of human existence, it becomes a purely theoretic belief, a dead worship, and an outward service of works, alongside of which profane existence holds on its way unaffected. The world of religious life should be a living reality to the people, and therefore they should see its mirror everywhere in the world of sense, and learn to feel its reality and necessity. The speech in deeds of a symbolic action might become a symbolic address, as in the case of the ancient prophets who employed the one to make the other more impressive, and as Jesus exercised it daily in the course of His ministry of healing. But symbolism was not sufficient for Him. It shows no truly divine revelation in the world surrounding us. That first begins where we see order and rule, where we perceive that the same regulations hold within the domain of the higher religious life, and that the same divine thoughts are realized in both spheres. In the one, however, there must be something more than the equality between one individual and another; there must be a parallel drawn from the relation between natural and human existence and its laws, and the relations of the higher religio-ethical life, so that from one the law for the other may be inferred. This is done by parabolic language. The Old Testament presents nothing but feeble fragments of anything of the kind (comp. 2 Sam. xii. 1–4; Isa. v. 1 ff., xxviii. 23 ff.). As forming the prevailing singularity in Jesus' popular addresses, it is His own invention.

It is to mistake the profound character of Jesus' didactic method to deduce an arbitrary conception of parabolic language from one series of Jesus' parabolic narratives, and then to take refuge in the miserable subterfuge that other passages refer to parables in the wider sense. The evangelists, who indisputably rest their accounts on Jesus' customary mode of speaking, know nothing of this distinction. Jesus Himself called the shortest sayings, in which He referred to the analogy of some circumstance in nature or in human existence, just as much parables as His longer narratives (comp. Luke iv. 23, Matt. xxiv. 32 with Mark iv. 11), and so, too, did the evangelists (comp. Luke vi. 39, Mark vii. 17

with Luke xv. 3, xix. 11; Matt. xxii. 1). There is in His didactic method a flawless ascent from the scantiest references to ordinary circumstances, to the most vividly coloured amplification of the same; the passage is imperceptive from the vivid description of His regulations to their representation in the narrative of a single case in which, owing to particular circumstances, they are most clearly and impressively set forth. Incidents of daily occurrence are related as a single event, as, for example, in the sower sowing his seed, and the woman baking her bread (Luke viii. 4–8, xiii. 21); events occurring once in circumstances the most remarkable are only mentioned on account of the universal law which they reflect, as when the searcher discovers a treasure in the field of another man (Matt. xiii. 44), or when the giver of a feast has himself to seek for guests behind the fences and hedges (Luke xiv. 16–23). Things, such as the pearl of great price (Matt. xiii. 45 f.), and the seeing eye (Luke xi. 34–36), which have long been ennobled by being used in symbolic language, and relationships which had long been elevated in the figurative language of the Old Testament into the similitude of what was highest, as, for example, when paternal love became the similitude of God's divine love to His people, are interchanged with the things of everyday life, like the lost piece of money (Luke xv. 8 f.), and the entrance of thieves (Matt. xxiv. 43 f.), and with relations which in the ordinary course of things do not exist without coarseness and paltry deceit (Luke xvi. 1–8).

The sphere belonging to nature is abundantly displayed. The tree with its fruits, the vine and its grapes, the juicy twig and the dry wood, the seed-corn mouldering in the ground, its sprouting and bringing forth of fruit, and its growth into a mighty tree, the tares among the wheat as well as in the garden, the course of the sun, circumscribing the hours of the day, the eagle which descends upon the corpse, and the wild sow wallowing in the mire. The sower scatters his seed and gathers the harvest in his barns, the gardener plants the fig-tree and manures it, the shepherd herds his sheep, following those who go astray, and dividing the sheep from the goats. When the wolf approaches, then it is seen who is the good shepherd and who the hireling; the thief climbs the

wall and slaughters the sheep. The fisherman casts out his net, and sits down on the shore that he may divide his spoil. Down to the townsman's dispute, laying waste both town and kingdom, no standing or relation of life is wanting. They are all here,—the builder and merchant, the general, doctor, baker, and tailor, the wine-drinker and cooper, the rich man and the beggar before his door, the creditor and his debtor, the watchman and the thief, the blind man and his guide, the master of the house exhibiting his treasures, the mother in her sorest need, the maid-servant carrying the lamp, the little ones who cast the crumbs from their tables to the dogs, the children at play, and the sons at work, the free son and the purchased slave, the servant and the labourer, the bridegroom and his friends, the bride and her maidens, the honoured guests who occupy the best places at the feast, and the man in rags who is thrust forth.

A parable is no allegory. In the allegory the individual traits are freely chosen and are poetically composed, so as to shadow forth by a figure what it is attempted to describe. An allegory represents the copy by sensible signs, but it proves nothing; it is a poetical adornment, but it does not instruct. The intention of the parable is to demonstrate something. Not, of course, in the sense of a logical demonstration. It desires to teach by the rules of everyday existence how the laws of the higher life may be understood; it endeavours to expound God's primitive revelation by the laws which He binds on all existence, and according to which the life of man must be developed, even although in sin and folly. It follows, therefore, that the separate incidents of the parable cannot be freely invented or arbitrarily combined, in order to be employed in regard to some single point in the more elevated sphere of life. They must be borrowed from reality, and even in a narrative which has been freely invented they must be true in the higher sense, *i.e.* it must be possible that they might occur in given circumstances. Besides this, they must serve to illustrate a given relation or an actual ordinance; for in the reality of this rule rests the power of the parable to demonstrate, as well as its didactic worth. Its very intention is to exhibit an ordinance, law, or rule of the higher life, and by so doing to prove that it

is divinely ordered, and that the divinely-ordered relations of natural existence present us with analogies.

The allegory is bound by no rule, for it is freely composed, and has no connection with the regulations of real life; its significance consists in the disclosure of the harmonies to which each separate feature refers. The parable can only be explained by a universal truth which follows from the transference of the rule which is represented to the sphere of the religio-ethical life, and to the regulations of the kingdom of God. This distinction, which is not often clearly recognised, was early obliterated. Just as Jesus' metaphors were used in such various ways by our tradition, so did the word-pictures allure to a more ample application and more practical realization. It is not absolutely impossible, however, that Jesus Himself, when He had uttered a parable, took from it in His subsequent address detached figurative incidents to which He gave a practical, if allegorical, application. But this does not remove the radical difference between the original intention of parabolic language by which its most exact interpretation is conditioned, and the allegorizing explanation and practical application of its separate features. The fact of this distinction not being strictly held by our tradition is the reason why even these word-pictures are not there preserved with literal fidelity.[1] In many instances Jesus Himself gives the interpretation by expressing in an apothegm the rule which is to be represented, and directly or indirectly transferring it to the higher state of existence; these interpretations, which are undoubtedly the most original, we must plainly take as the standard for our own. By them alone can we measure the explanations which here and there our evangelists have annexed or introduced, and which really pass from the interpretation to the instructive

[1] It is useless to try to avoid the recognition of this fact. The various forms in which these parabolic addresses occur, and the variety of interpretations which they acquire by the change of connection, make this acknowledgment inevitable. There is in this no question as to deviations in form, or as to the difference in description or narration, or in more or less entire completeness; incidents, manifestly allegorical, are there interwoven which have no connection whatever with the fundamental ideas of the parable, but only in view of their practical realization. It is still often possible for us to distinguish them, for the original form of the parabolic speech is still preserved, but frequently we can only recognise them because of their incongruity with the intended meaning of the parable.

application. If no attention is paid to this, the explanation of the parable will become an unbridled play of fancy, the transparent perspicuity of these word-pictures a constant puzzle to an antiquated interest in mysteries, and the most popular of Jesus' addresses a perpetual offence to the first of didactic rules, which requires the possibility of an undoubted agreement.

The beauty of these parabolic addresses has been greatly lauded; Renan alone has mocked at the charming simplicity of the villager, and his ignorance of the great world. The poetic faculty of invention has been extolled, as well as the plastic power and the gorgeously coloured execution. But the materials are usually borrowed from Jesus' immediate surroundings, and from the most homely of circumstances while the execution is often not without flaws as a work of art. Even in this respect Jesus made no effort to reach any æsthetic ideal, He had exclusive regard to the practical consequence. In comparison, He possessed an incomparable means to this end. Almost all His greater parables are constructed by the operation of contrast. The haughty Pharisee is contrasted with the repentant publican, the merciful Samaritan with the heartless priest, the poor beggar with the rich man, the filial brother with the lost son, and the wise virgins with the foolish. In the same way, the debtor to whom much is forgiven is contrasted with the other to whom little, the obedient son with the disobedient, and the faithful servant with the false; so, too, with the thousand pounds and the hundred pence, the early morning hour in which the first disciples were called with the late evening hour, the invited guests with the beggars from the hedgerows, the one pearl with the whole possession, the tiniest of seeds with the wide-spreading tree, the plenitude of riches, which no storehouse can contain, with the sudden death which takes everything away. It is only another species of contrast, where Jesus selects the material for His parables from a sphere which has as little as possible in common with that to which the parable refers. It is from what the unabashed friend has in view, and the unjust judge finally accords, that it is to be inferred what the believing petitioner obtains; the unrighteous householder was intended as a lesson in the truly

prudent use of riches in the kingdom of God. It is these parables, on which the allegorizing exposition is constantly being wrecked, that an over-hasty criticism pronounces to be abortive, which are composed with transparent subtleness, and produce an inevitable result. They certainly proceed upon the assumption that even in a sinful world a higher necessity dominates, from which the former cannot be dissociated even if it abuses its laws. With these parables there are others contrasted, in which, on the contrary, the material is taken from a sphere of existence in close relation with that to which the application is to be made. At this point the parable passes almost into the illustrative narrative which, properly speaking, proves the general truth through the evidence of the deed. The rich man, who is termed "thou fool;" he who lifted up his eyes, being in torments; and the merciful Samaritan,—might apparently, as well as the Pharisees and publicans, stand either for examples or for parables; yet the first classification never exhausts their most profound significance.

Whenever one thought was to be examined from different sides, Jesus seems to have made a purpose of illustrating it through two parables; our tradition still preserves a not inconsiderable number of these pairs. Even the oldest source contains one address in which a long series of parables presents a connecting thread of ideas upon which Jesus developed a succession of fundamental truths. That would certainly have been impossible had the parables been allegories, the accumulation of which could only puzzle the hearer and destroy every impression. But if the parable is only the pictorial expression of a single compact truth, an illustrated gnome, then saying is in it added to saying, the radical relation in the ideas of which give the speech connection and unity.

The ultimate purpose of His parabolic method of teaching, Jesus has Himself explained in the tiny similitude which, in the oldest source, is placed at the conclusion of His parable-speech (Matt. xiii. 52). This treats of the scribe who is made a disciple of the kingdom of God, *i.e.* who has heard nothing of it, but because he himself has become a member of the kingdom of God, had learned its nature and laws from his

own experience. A man of this kind would act like a householder who, when exhibiting his treasures, not only produces his recent acquisitions, but the old and valuable furnishings of his house and his inherited jewels as well. Jesus proclaims not only the new truths, but He connects them with those which have long been known and acknowledged. Just as in the synagogue Jesus regarded the sacred history and the sacred statutes of the people of revelation as a great typical prophecy of the kingdom of God, which He was come to lay the foundations of, so in this case nature and human existence, with its well-known laws, became a typical prophecy of the statutes of that kingdom. It was by the Lake of Gennesareth, where nature disclosed all its charms, and where He was surrounded by a most animated human existence, that He gave in His parabolic address to the people the explanation of this prophecy, thoughtfully connecting the old with the new, and explaining and proving the new by means of the old.

# CHAPTER IX.

## THE FRIEND OF PUBLICANS AND SINNERS.

WHENEVER the Romans obtained supreme authority in Palestine, they introduced their system of taxation, as they had done in the neighbouring Asiatic provinces; and it was probably taken as a pattern by the Herodian princes. The customs were hired out either to individual Roman knights or to several who associated themselves together, and these contractors placed their collecting officers at the places appointed for paying dues. It is these officers who are called in the Gospels "publicans," and the "chief publican" who once appears on the scene (Luke xix. 2) was evidently an officer of the Roman contractors, entrusted with the control of the underlings. This latter class was generally chosen from the inhabitants of the provinces, as they best understood how to deal with the people. The whole system of taxation was thoroughly detested, partly from its being a token of alien domination, and partly on account of the restrictions thereby put on trade, the manifold forms of chicanery and extortion, and the oppressive assessments laid upon the people. The hatred so engendered was not unnaturally transferred to the countrymen who made themselves the instruments of this unpopular institution, and who by their dishonest conduct in office gave fuel to this dislike. Admonished by the contractors to make the taxes as profitable as possible, they were acquainted, besides, with too many ways of enriching themselves in addition by asking for more than the legal duties (Luke iii. 13), by trickery in calculating the value of goods (xix. 8), or by the bribes which purchased from them a more reasonable computation. Through such conduct the publicans fell into ever greater disrepute; they were regarded as half Gentiles (Matt. xviii. 17; comp. v. 46 with ver. 47), and were classed

with harlots and other disreputable characters (Matt. xxi. 32). Their contemporaries regarded them as incapacitated for acting as witnesses in a civil cause, and as partially excluded from the community of the theocratic people. It is true, however, that they shared this position with many others. In Galilee, more especially, where the population contained a large Gentile element, a numerous class existed whose members increasingly estranged themselves from the customs of their fathers and from the strict observance of the law, whether induced to do so by necessity or by the levity and bias to dissoluteness produced by close association with Gentiles and their sinful practices. Among this class fornication and usury, sensuality and avarice, were the order of the day; its members were either formally excommunicated from the congregation, or else were popularly looked upon as apostates from whose society the strictly orthodox Jew held himself aloof, for he regarded them as unclean, and any intercourse with them as dishonouring. It was with these notoriously gross sinners that the publicans were classed.

We can easily understand the deep impression that Jesus' appearance in Galilee must have made upon this class of people. He drew no distinction between them and the rest of the nation, for His call to repentance was addressed to all without exception, and in His eyes His countrymen were all alike sinners. He proclaimed, indeed, the kingdom of God, not, however, by reserving participation in it for one class or another, but by giving admission to one and all under the condition of repentance. It was difficult for the austere Pharisee to understand why absolute repentance should be required of him, but from the accusations of conscience, as well as the disdain of those around them (John iii. 4, 7), these people had long learned that they were sinners. Jesus, however, did not come to condemn, but to save (John iii. 16). He extended to them also a helping hand, giving them back their long lost consciousness as well as the hope of sharing in God's kingdom and promises, which they had long abandoned. The grace of God, which established the kingdom in Israel, was for them also; to the most degraded creatures it stooped to succour and to save. And therefore they presented themselves before Jesus, confessing their sins, promising

conversion at His divine word, rising to newness of life, and sensibly receiving the power to continue in it. It was in such cases that Jesus found what He sought—sincere confession of sin, serious resolution to begin a new life, and fervent devotion to Him whose power, they felt, could alone give them the necessary strength. In this way He became in very truth the friend of publicans and sinners.[1]

Since Mark makes express mention of the fact that Jesus quitted Capernaum in order to teach the people by the seaside, and that it was when passing along He saw Levi the publican, the son of Alphæus, sitting at the place of toll (Mark ii. 13 f.), it is most improbable that the custom-house was close to the town (comp. p. 104, note). The great Roman road from Damascus crossed the Jordan to the south of Lake Merom, and led down to the lake by way of Khan Minyeh, situated on the northern margin of the plain of Gennesareth. Here Levi's booth would be situated, which Jesus was obliged to pass whenever He went along the road. Probably the publican had often quitted his stand before this to listen to the great Master when He preached near the seashore; perhaps a long-cherished wish was realized when Jesus summoned him to join His escort. Certainly, it is just as improbable in this case as in that of the two sets of brothers that Jesus was unacquainted with Levi when He called him to constant companionship, and that Levi had not long been a follower of the man for whose sake he left house and calling. In this case it was a question of joining the apostolate in the stricter sense, for only to enter upon a new calling could Jesus summon him to quit the old,—a step which was not required by mere discipleship. Tradition says that he afterwards bore in the apostolic circle the name of Matthew.

[1] An attempt has recently been made to explain this by the preference felt by a man of the people for the lower classes, and it has been interpreted as showing a certain democratic tinge. But there was no such thing in Israel as what we call difference of rank. The priesthood formed the only order privileged by birth; that of letters was entered by choice, and gained the intellectual direction of the people by its own exertions. The Pharisees were not an order, but a party, and the most national of all. The mass of the people had no divisions in our sense of the term, and the publicans and sinners were not divided by their rank from the other classes, but by the character of their walk and conversation.

Thus from this people of bad repute, God gave Jesus a disciple who, once won over to His cause, could be useful to Him in many ways. He was one who understood how to handle his pen, and after history showed what a valuable acquisition this was for the church, for it was he who left the earliest memoranda of the life of Jesus (comp. book i. chap. ii.). In any case, it is a perfectly untenable criticism which doubts the credibility of this primitive tradition.[1]

Just as after the call of Simon, Jesus was a self-invited guest at his house (Mark i. 18, 29), so now He entered the dwelling of His newly-called disciple, accompanied by His other stated companions, who probably numbered more than the original four; here Levi prepared a dinner for Him, to which he naturally invited many of his associates—publicans and sinners (ii. 15).[2] It was on this occasion that the offence given by Jesus' intercourse with these people of evil repute was first given expression to. Some scribes of the Pharisaical party were indignant that one who passed for a Rabbi among the people should have so little consideration for. the honour of the learned profession as to associate with such bad company; and that He who pretended to be a preacher of virtue did not hesitate to contaminate Himself by the society of such disreputable characters. None of them, it is true, dared say this in so many words to Jesus, they were contented with

[1] The supposition that Jesus only called Levi into the more comprehensive circle of disciples, besides resting upon totally false conceptions regarding this circle (comp. book iv. chap. vi.), only arose because the name Levi does not occur among the names of the twelve apostles known to us. But in the first evangelist's version of this narrative, the publican is expressly called Matthew (Matt. ix. 9), and in his list of apostles this Matthew is described as the (former) publican (Matt. x. 3). There is no reason whatever for supposing that in this there was any confusion. Levi is a common proper name among the Jews, and Matthew is certainly nothing but a surname, signifying probably a gift, *i.e.* one given by God. It is quite in Mark's manner to call him in this place by his proper name (as in chap. i. 16 as regards Simon), and not until chap. iii. 18 by the name which he bore in the apostolic circle. He certainly seems to know nothing about Jesus' having given it, although that is by no means improbable.

[2] Luke's apprehension of Mark's narrative was in this respect correct (v. 29); it is only the first evangelist who, thinking of Jesus as dwelling in Capernaum, has interpreted the words to mean that Jesus gave a feast (Matt. ix. 10); and this view of his, which, although it does not correspond with the connection, is still defended by many expounders, has given rise to the idea that the place of toll was beside the city.

making a spiteful observation to this effect to His disciples. As soon as Jesus heard of it, however, the explanation of His action was at once given in figurative terms. Just as a physician does not visit the healthy but the sick, because the latter have need of him, even so His calling is not to the righteous, but to the sinners. He associates with them, therefore, not in spite of their being sinners, but precisely because they are; He does not repulse them when they come, nay more, He calls them to Him, for the divine commission with which He is charged must be more especially executed in regard to them (Mark ii. 16 f.).[1]

What this commission was Luke endeavoured to define more particularly when speaking of a call to repentance (v. 32). This, too, was certainly in Jesus' thoughts, but was not expressed by what He said. The important point is that He, conscious as He was of His Messianic calling, should characterize it as being intended for sinners. Even the Baptist had supposed that the Messiah would only come to separate by the judgment the bad from the true members of the chosen people, and then with these righteous ones to establish the kingdom of God. But Jesus was aware that judged by His standard none were righteous and deserving of the kingdom. As the only sinless One, He was placed in contrast with a sinful nation, and yet it was He who should bring them salvation. But a sinful people could not participate in this salvation; for that there was needed a purification which could only be accomplished by the communication of the divine forgiveness of sins, even as the prophets had foretold should take place in the Messianic age (comp. vol. i. p. 242).

[1] The first evangelist has introduced into Jesus' answer (Matt. ix. 12 f.) a reference to Hos. vi. 6, which, according to the oldest source, Jesus employed in another connection (Matt. xii. 7). It does, in truth, break the close connection which here exists between figure and interpretation, and explains Jesus' conduct by charitable duty, while Jesus expressly refers it to His professional obligation. To ask who the healthy and righteous are, is to misunderstand the parable altogether. For Jesus there was no such distinction, nor does He speak of it; the contrast only illustrates the leading idea. If there *were* any righteous, He would have as little to do with them as the physician had with the sound in body. A relation between the call to sinners and the call of Christ, as it is meant in the apostolic didactic language, or even the invitation to the feast, which is connected with the view contested above, is in contradiction with the simple tenor of the words.

And this was why His message concerning the kingdom had always to begin by proclaiming the forgiveness of their sins to all who were conscious of their guilt, and felt themselves thereby undeserving of the salvation which the new era was to bring. At one blow their religious circumstances underwent a radical change. They were as sure as Jesus Himself of God's unconditioned good pleasure; they dared to regard themselves as members of the perfected theocracy, or of the kingdom of God, in which Israel's ideal was realized, and as children of God, *i.e.* as objects of His paternal love, who might expect from Him what He had promised the future had in store. There was in this a new and constraining motive-power to repentance. That had indeed commenced when they condemned their previous life as sinful, and desired forgiveness, but the assurance of having the guilt of the past removed, and the consciousness of the grace of God being turned towards them, must necessarily impel them to attest their repentance by a new life.

Among the laws of Israel there was one ordinance on the ground of which the sinner was absolved from his guilt and restored to covenant fellowship with God; this was the sin-offering. But the sacrifice of expiation could only be applied to a very limited circle of unwitting or unintentional errors, and the continually-recurring need of atonement taught the individual as well as the people that it could not effect an enduring and unclouded communion with God. The pious singers of Israel had approached God without sacrifice, imploring Him to forgive their sins, and had obtained the answer to their prayers. But who dared put himself on a level with them? Now here was One who, in God's name, proclaimed to all repentant sinners His grace and forgiveness, and not for one or other sin in particular, but for all their sins without exception; not for to-day and to-morrow, or until the committal of fresh transgressions, but boundless in its application, and with express reference to the coming kingdom in which Jehovah in His mercy would grant all promised blessings to the nation, freed from sin. Surprise has been expressed at Jesus' bestowing the forgiveness of sins without further explanation,—without mentioning His death as the necessary presupposition; indeed, the inference has been drawn from this, that it was the

apostolic development of doctrine which first placed the two in connection. But we shall afterwards meet with most distinct statements of Jesus to the effect that His death was requisite for the completion of His work, and that the entrance of the justified people into the new covenant relationship with God was brought about by Him. Only an absolutely unhistorical method of looking at Jesus' doctrine can demand that now, when no one was thinking of His death, and would therefore never have been able to grasp the idea of its redemptive effect, it should have been mentioned as the presupposition for the forgiveness of sins, which He communicated. But it is also impossible to simply insert this tacit presupposition. As certainly as the forgiveness of sins bestowed by the Old Covenant was directly effective, and not only a reference to what was to be gained by Jesus' death, so that which Jesus bestowed was far more than a reference to this future.[1] As yet the time was not come that would make this redemptive and expiatory death an inevitable necessity; the grace of God, which appeared in the Messiah, offered His people the full forgiveness of their sins, attaching to it no other condition than repentant desire.

In this sense Jesus was come to offer divine forgiveness to the sinners He called to Himself, and so for the first time to make repentance truly possible; and precisely because the worst sinners were most readily desirous to receive it penitently, did He prefer to associate with them. The offence, given by this conduct of His, was not concealed even in the oldest source (Matt. xi. 19); but it was most often alluded to in the source peculiar to Luke's Gospel. Mention is there made of the irritation that was caused by Jesus' intercourse with publicans and sinners, and how, in particular, the austere

[1] It is of some importance, for the correct apprehension of the signification which Jesus' death had for salvation, that this fact be recognised as undeniable. It neither prejudices the necessity for His death, nor the mediation by Him of the forgiveness of sins; but it certainly teaches how one of God's ordinances, resting upon a historical fact, may also be understood from the historical necessity for this fact, which, according to the fundamental laws of all history, could only increase and develop in the course of events. It does not shut out the eternal decrees of God, which overrule all history, if we human beings can here, as everywhere, only partially discover this secret of a divine decree which is accomplished in a history dependent upon the free operation of man.

observers of the law were exasperated that Jesus ate with them; for that act was regarded of old as expressing a peculiarly close companionship, and those who were on terms of intimacy with impure persons were looked upon as being especially polluted (Luke xv. 1 f.). It was in reply to this reproach that Jesus related the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke xv. 11–32).[1] The greatness of God's love—which, beyond the comprehension of ordinary man, is joyfully received by the repentant sinner—is here described by the increasing envy of the brother who has remained faithful, and who cannot look on with patience while the father not only receives his prodigal son, but is unable to express his joy sufficiently by the feast he gives. The mild admonition of the murmuring brother is a most overpowering criticism of the Pharisaic murmuring against Jesus' love to sinners; and it shows that this parable must have belonged to that early period when Jesus sought to explain His procedure even to the party averse to Him, and to remove their prejudices (comp. Mark ii. 16 f.). The didactic point of the story is contained, properly speaking, in the second portion of the parable (Luke xv. 25–32), which is meant to show that the divine reception of sinners, as brought about by Jesus through His intercourse with publicans and sinners, need not prove a stone of stumbling, but should rather be recognised and lauded as a proof of God's joy in their conversion.[2] Certainly the presupposition of these points is more vividly portrayed

[1] Luke conjoins with it the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money (vv. 3–10), both of which describe God's anxious love for sinners. The precise point of these two parables is somewhat different, however, although they may be interpreted as referring to the glad welcome given to the repentant sinner; and we shall see later on that they belonged originally to a totally different connection. On the other hand, the supposition that the parable of the prodigal son is only a later remodelling of the parable of the man with two sons (Matt. xxi. 28–31), is absolutely untenable, since the didactic point of the last named is entirely different.

[2] This certainly shows the impossibility of an allegorizing interpretation, even within the modest limits in which it is regarded as being admissible. The faithful brother is not a Pharisee, not even a better-intentioned one; for in Jesus' eyes the Pharisee was equally a sinner with the lowest of the people. Neither does he stand for a truly pious Israelite; to him Jesus could not have ascribed such expressions of ill-will and envy. The modern idea, that it refers to repentant Gentilism and self-righteous Judaism, is utterly opposed to the application vindicated for it by the evangelist when he adduces the cause which

in the first part of the parable (xv. 11–24); and the fact of its material being taken from a sphere so suggestive of God's fatherly forgiving love, has had much to do with the parable being applied allegorically.[1] In it Jesus drew a typical story of human failings, which, beginning with a mistaken desire for liberty and a longing for unbridled pleasures, closes in shameful servitude, want, and misery; and yet the story is enacted among the simplest circumstances of actual life, the interpreting of which singly would be artificial and unnatural. More than all, however, it was with the profoundly tender descriptions of the awakening desire for a better life, the resolution to return, the tender and unreserved love of the father, forgetting all that had passed, and the reinstatement —far surpassing his boldest expectations—of the returned wanderer in his privilege of sonship, that Jesus touched the heart of the world of sinners and roused in it the hope of a better future, the assurance of divine forgiveness, and readiness to repent. Although this story was first told to self-righteous Pharisees,—it must surely have passed from mouth to mouth among the publicans and sinners,—it became the palladium of all troubled consciences, the patent of nobility for the debased and outcast; more than all the preaching of repentance, it has drawn hearts to the Friend of sinners, with whom is found peace and salvation. At the close of the narrative we catch the keynote again, showing us that what is a fundamental idea in the Johannine speeches of Christ is really grounded upon words of Jesus. The son is not only lost

led to the parable being spoken. This is therefore not an allegory, but a story from everyday life, in which the envious agitation of the elder brother is by no means irreconcilable with his good behaviour hitherto; his admonition, therefore, only serves to prove what an unwarranted step it is to abridge it in any way by subtracting the praise and reward of his previous conduct.

[1] That was certainly, however, not the reason for this subject being selected; in human relationships it is indeed only a father's love which is in a position so to pardon, and from which joy at the son's return can remove every remembrance of the grief suffered on his account. Indeed, the allegorical application of the parable to the relation of man to God cannot be intended, since Jesus never described this relation as being a filial one, and, in any case, apprehended the paternal relationship in which God stood to the subjects of the kingdom as a relationship of love, which, unique in its character, and certainly included in the original destiny of humanity, had not yet been realized. And, besides, there is here an express distinction drawn between sin against God and against the father (vv. 18, 21), which would throw the whole allegory into confusion.

and found: he was dead and is alive again (Luke xv. 24, 32). A life of sin and alienation from God is death; the true life begins with conversion, in confidence on Jesus' word.

A narrative (vii. 36–48) belonging to this period, when the relation between Jesus and the Pharisees was not yet one of intense hostility, is preserved by Luke out of his peculiar source. Jesus had been invited, and had accepted the invitation, to the house of a Pharisee. It must not be inferred from His gentle reproach (vii. 44–46) that the host had violated the duties of hospitality due to a guest; for greeting with a kiss was only a token of peculiar affection, as the anointing of the head was of honourable distinction. The washing of feet was regarded as the first duty of hospitality only when the guests came from a journey (comp. Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21). But the reception must certainly have been a cool one; the invitation was to Jesus as a distinguished Rabbi, but did not involve any intimate relation to Him. All the greater was the contrast presented by the scene which took place at the feast. A sinful woman, well known in the town as pursuing there her dissolute trade, had scarcely heard that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, than she appeared with a vessel of ointment, in order to testify her love and reverence. She belonged indisputably to those who were brought to repentance by Jesus' words, and who felt themselves constrained to show their gratitude to Him to whom they were indebted for salvation for time and eternity. Throwing herself weeping on the ground, she bathed with hot tears the feet of Him who was then reclining at table; then drying His feet with her hair, she kissed and anointed them. Perhaps she regarded herself as unworthy to touch the great man's head, or it may be, this customary testimony of reverence did not suffice to express what she felt.

On this occasion as well, the Pharisees were greatly scandalized that Jesus should find satisfaction in this testimony of love and esteem from a person of such bad character; they could only explain it by supposing He did not know the woman, and therefore that He was lacking in that penetration into the hearts of men which He must needs have possessed if He were truly the prophet His followers at least believed.

But Jesus, perceiving the thoughts of his host, related to him a parable of two debtors; to one of whom was remitted fifty, to the other five hundred pence, and made him put the point of it in words—that the second man would have most love to the merciful creditor. Jesus thereupon drew his host's attention to the contrast between the cold welcome he had given and the ardent love which the woman had exhibited, and inferred by the simplest application of the parable that she must have experienced great forgiveness to consider herself bound to show such fervent gratitude; proving by this that not only was He well acquainted with the woman, but that He knew her better than the Pharisees did. He was not only aware of her having been a great sinner, but He knew also of her repentant conversion, and of her having received the forgiveness of her sins. He signified at the same time, however, that the reason why the Pharisee held himself aloof was his indisposition to receive as yet what Jesus has particularly come to bring. And thereupon He dismissed the woman with His personal confirmation of the forgiveness of her sins, the assurance of which she had gathered from His preaching.[1]

Vain attempts have been made to discover who this woman was, but Mary of Magdala has generally been fixed upon, from the story having, as it is alleged, taken place in that town. The manner, however, in which Luke mentions Mary Magdalene in chap. viii., but without the slightest reference to this story, tells rather against this view. The celebrated identification of both women with Mary of Bethany, arrived at by Hengstenberg from a romantic interweaving of several

[1] It disturbs the whole point of the narrative to assume that forgiveness of sins was in any sense accorded to the woman in consequence of her demonstration of affection. This assumption has no countenance either from the parable from which Jesus deduces the conclusion, or from the contrast which He draws in ver. 47. It is not because of this evidence of affection that her sins are forgiven her, but that is why He recognises her as a pardoned sinner. In regard to another point also, it is evident that the parable must not be allegorized; the Pharisee is not the debtor to whom a small sum is remitted, nor does the statement that to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little, apply to him (ver. 47), for it was the fact of his not having sought and found forgiveness which made his bearing to Jesus so chilly. Luke has added to the narrative of his source the statement that offence was given by Jesus bestowing the forgiveness of sins, and that the woman, by reason of her faith, was dismissed in peace (vii. 49, 50). But the one statement is as plainly a reminiscence of Mark ii. 7, as the other is of Mark v. 34.

evangelical traditions, is a phantasy absolutely untenable. Criticism proceeds upon similar lines when it identifies this narrative with the anointing in Bethany (Mark xiv.; John xii.) shortly before Jesus' death, although the only resemblance between the two stories is Jesus receiving at the hands of a woman the anointing which was the ordinary token of esteem. The fact of both incidents giving occasion for reproach only yields a deceptive appearance of similarity, for the whole tenor of the narratives is totally different. It cannot be supposed that any re-formation has taken place in tradition; in that case the main theme would have remained the same, although the details were varied, but it would never happen that the theme of the narrative was completely remodelled while the external framework remained the same. This was the less likely to occur in the case in question, since the date of the incident which occurred at Bethany, must, as well as its reference to Jesus' approaching death, have been retained by memory, while the other narrative, from the position which in it Jesus took up towards the Pharisees, clearly points to the early period of His ministry. Recourse has therefore to be had to a remodelling with a purpose, to which Luke, with his Pauline views, had little inducement, for he satisfied his dogmatic interests by adding the concluding sentences (vii. 50).[1]

The experience which Jesus gained of the publicans on one hand, and the Pharisees on the other (comp. Luke vii. 29 f.), was what led Him to regard them as types of repentant humility and self-righteous pride. He so employed them

[1] Even Strauss has endeavoured to demonstrate this in a hyper-artificial way, by combining the narrative with the story of the adulteress in John viii., which is of an entirely different character, or with the accused sinner in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is of equal improbability. The parable in Luke vii. 41 f. has at one time been regarded as the true historical kernel of the narrative; at another as a foreign addition, although it only possesses significance from the situation of the narrative, and forms a preparative for its proper theme; to regard it, however, as a mere variation of the parable in Matt. xviii. 23–35 is a most arbitrary proceeding. To acknowledge that this narrative is entirely distinct from the anointing at Bethany neither excludes the possibility that after Luke had employed the one he intentionally omitted the other, for it can otherwise be proved that in cases where two narratives somewhat resembled each other he intentionally incorporated one only, nor that through him, or through his source, single traits from the one story may not have mingled with the other. This is very evident in regard to the giver of the feast in Bethany,

afterwards in a parable which Luke has preserved to us (xviii. 10–14). A Pharisee enters the temple to thank God that he is no gross sinner as other men are, casting as he does a contemptuous glance upon a timid publican standing at his side. He gives an account to God of how he fasts twice in the week, and pays tithes for his earnings beyond what the law requires. The publican, however, not daring to raise his eyes, implores the pardoning mercy of God as he smites upon his breast. And Jesus declares that the latter only departed justified by God. Although this parable also was taken from a sphere of life which had close connection with that to which application was intended, because only in it was the truth to which it referred really imprinted, yet it was no mere example; it was not intended to teach in what frame of mind people ought to enter the sanctuary to obtain there the greatest desire of every pious soul, but it represents, as is shown by Jesus' closing words, the general truth that it is only repentant humility and not self-righteous pride which obtains the grace of God that is needed by all.[1]

The manner in which this man glories in his voluntary fasting is a true example of the contradictions in which the Pharisees were involved by their self-righteous pride (Luke xviii. 12). Originally the natural expression of mourning on account of severe misfortunes in the family, or for public calamities, fasting was in its religious significance the expression of mourning for personal sins, and therefore the only fast strictly required by law was on the great day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 29 f.). Though refraining from what satisfied the

called Simon in Mark xiv. 3, and the host in our narrative, who, though not even named at the commencement (Luke vii. 36, 39), is all at once addressed as Simon in ver. 40, and is called by this name in vv. 43 and 44. This may be also so in regard to the drying with the hair (vv. 38, 44), which so strikingly reminds one of John xii. 3, especially as it seems scarcely applicable to the case of feet which were only wet with tears; but there is assuredly no ground for deriving the alabaster vase, such as is used at the present day for the same purpose, from Mark, or the anointing of the feet from John, which is here referred to by the whole situation.

[1] On the other hand, the reference which Luke gives to the parable by adding to the close of chap. xviii. 14 a remark from chap. xiv. 11 belonging to a totally different connection, is usually taken in too wide a sense, as is also the case with the address, which is not quite easy to understand, in consequence of which He gave the parable (xviii. 9), for it did not treat of pride and humility in general, and still less of the requital of both.

carnal man, the sorrow of repentance was combined with the didactic purpose of directing the soul to divine things, and so producing the religious frame of mind fitted for serious resolutions and repentant conversion. But this twofold meaning had been lost in the traditional fasts; in unison with the legal leaning of the time, fasting was regarded, without regard to its cause and effect, as an external performance by which a man exhibited piety and earned divine satisfaction. In regard to this point also, Jesus appeared to separate Himself from the devout of Israel, and rather to accommodate Himself to the more easy way of the publicans and sinners with whom He so readily associated. For it is a fact that He and His disciples did not bind themselves to the observance of this pious custom. We shall learn from the oldest source (Matt. xi. 19) in what an offensive way this was afterwards construed, but even Mark speaks of the bitterness it roused. It was on one of these traditional fast days on which the Pharisees fasted, as well as all who desired to distinguish themselves by piety, that Jesus was asked why His disciples did not fast, as John's had done, and as the scholars of the Pharisees now did. But the question was more than this, it was an indirect reproach that He did not direct His disciples better. It is not usually observed, however, that the pith of the question lay in the appeal to the disciples of John. It was really Jesus' own affair whether He attached Himself to the Pharisaic party, and observed their rigid customs; but when John's disciples joined in those fasting exercises, their master must have directed them to do so, and if he whom Jesus Himself had recognised as one of God's prophets pronounced in favour of these practices, they must surely be binding upon the truly devout (Mark ii. 18).[1] Jesus justified the conduct of His disciples by declaring that for them it was

[1] From the connection in which he places this story, Mark lets it be supposed that the questioners were those who were generally the first to take offence at Jesus' conduct—the scribes of the Pharisaic party (ii. 16). His two redactors connect the narrative with the preceding one of the publican's feast; Luke, like Mark, mentions the scribes and Pharisees (Luke v. 30, 33), but Matthew the disciples of John (Matt. ix. 14), which is impossible, for they could not ask about the reason of their own fasting, or appeal to the example of the Pharisees. It is interesting to notice how Luke points his Gentile-Christian readers to the religious character of those customs by uniting prayers with fasts.

not a time of mourning, but of rejoicing, leading back by this to the original meaning of fasting. He did not give utterance to a polemic against their hereditary views, but rather gave expression to His own, according to which fasting should only be the expression of inward need; His views alone could have any influence with His disciples, and thus He withdrew any ground for their observing the traditional fasts. Jesus showed by a parable how the present was for His disciples a time of joy which did not admit of sorrow, and therefore gave no occasion for fasting. There is in this world no more gladsome period than the wedding-day. When the bridegroom is conducted by his friends into the bridal chamber, that is for them a time of perfect enjoyment. If it should happen, however, that the bridegroom were seized away by sudden death in the midst of the marriage rejoicings, then would it be time for them to fast, though that would not be thought so long as the festivities lasted (Mark ii. 19 f.). The meaning of the parable was very evident. Jesus desired to say that the present was a joyous time for His disciples, because they had Him in their midst who had proclaimed to them the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, and because they had found Him who promised them the coming of the blessed era of finished salvation. In these circumstances there was no room for sorrow and fasting. But if any one wished to reflect on the didactic value of fasting, He was now with them who could in a truer way direct their minds to divine things than by the outward refraining from earthly pleasures.[1]

With all this, however, the question was not yet answered how the disciples of John, instructed as they were by God's great prophet, could keep to an observance from which

[1] Jesus did not thereby intend to compare Himself to the bridegroom, or His disciples with the friends. The very exceptional case of a bridegroom suddenly dying in the midst of the wedding festivities was an illustration in parable of how incompatible it was with mourning in the ordinary course of events. On the other hand, so soon as Jesus was regarded allegorically as the bridegroom, the case had indeed happened. Jesus was torn from His disciples, and by a violent death, although that is not actually involved in the words. Mark had manifestly thought of this, for, instead of the hypothetical form which alone was suitable to the parable, he gives in ver. 20 a prophetic statement about the days which will come, etc. To such a prophecy, however, this connection presented not the remotest occasion.

Jesus released His disciples. To this part of the question Jesus replied in two parables (Mark ii. 21 f.),—the one representing how injudicious it is to mend an old worn-out garment with a piece of new cloth, for whenever it shrinks, the thin part tears, and the rent is made worse; the other, to put new wine into old skins, since the fermenting juice will burst the skins, and both will perish: in the same way it would be ill-judged for the disciples of John to seek to adopt the new manner of life of Jesus' disciples, which did not admit of fasting. They still hold to the old standpoint, for along with their master they are waiting for the revelation of the Messiah, they have not as yet found *Him* in Jesus' appearance and operations, and for them the joyful age of the kingdom of God has not dawned (comp. Matt. xi. 11, and book iv. chap. i.). How could they adopt customs and methods of fasting, which proceed upon the assumption that this joyous time now exists in fellowship with the great Distributor of happiness of the Messianic age? (comp. vol. i. p. 385). Luke adds a few tender apologetic words by Jesus, which, however, can hardly belong to this connection, where He by no means apologizes for John's disciples, but correctly explains their conduct—plainly pointed out to them by the Baptist—from their own standpoint. But since the words doubtless refer to such as cannot readily accommodate themselves to the new ways of His disciples, the application must bear upon them also (Luke v. 39). No man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.[1]

[1] Luke gives special prominence to the fact that in order to get a piece of cloth, which yet cannot make the old garment sound, a new garment must needs be cut up (v. 36), *i.e.* that the new method of life is only disturbed when a single piece, such as the new customs of fasting, is torn from it; but that is nothing but an allegorical embellishment which is perfectly applicable neither to the parable nor the application. Even at the present day, it is usually overlooked how the reference in the context of this parable is to John's disciples, although Luke openly recognised this allusion, and probably Matthew also, who introduces it in contrast to the marriage joy in ix. 16; and it can only be said that the retention of the old forms for His disciples, who occupy a new standpoint, would have been a mistake. But this would plainly not suit the parable, which represents particularly the unsuitability of combining what is new with what is old, but not of combining the old with the new. It is absolutely inconceivable, however, that the old-established fasts could in any way be regarded as new patches with which to do up the old nature, or as something by which to infuse a new spirit into it.

If the two last parables were abstracted from their context, and were taken in a more allegorical sense, it might easily be supposed that the new material and new wine were suggestive of the new doctrine and spirit of Jesus, meaning thereby that both were incompatible with the old forms of Israelitish piety. But it was overlooked in doing so that the parables did not correspond with this idea, for the result which is evidently represented as unfortunate would then answer to the intention; the destroying of the old forms would, in that case, be the most natural way for clearing a path for the development of the new. In spite of this, it is not absolutely improbable that similar ideas were, at an early period, attached to such figurative words of Jesus as they were circulated from mouth to mouth, torn from the connection in which they were originally spoken. It even seems as if Mark, when proclaiming at the close the one correct procedure,—that new wine should be put into new skins (ii. 22), had had in his mind something of this kind, for the adducing of this fundamental principle had really nothing in common with the tendency of the parable. The procedure related in the parable therefore must be intended as an illustration to be taken conversely. But whether or not such interpretations of Jesus' words were likely to lead to a misconception of His intention, yet through the question regarding fasting, and the discussion which arose upon it, a question of principle was brought forward which was of far more comprehensive importance. If Jesus intended to bring about in the kingdom of God the complete realization of the divine will, what position would He take up to the endeavours at realizing this will, which had always existed in Israel? In many points His manner of life had already given offence to the scribes and Pharisees, and He could not go on much longer without a settlement with them and their whole system.

Jesus seized on the first opportunity of giving an explanation, and so of replying to that question.

# CHAPTER X.

## ON THE MOUNTAIN OF THE BEATITUDES.

FROM the earliest times Christians have been seeking the holy mount, and have usually fixed on a high isolated hill in the neighbourhood of Capernaum as being that on which Jesus delivered the long address beginning with the beatitudes, which tradition has preserved for us most completely. The true hill, however, has not been, and can never be, found; for we have already seen that the Gospels do not speak of a single mountain, but of a mountain height on the north-western shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, rising in the form of terraces, and presenting many a level spot on which the people might gather around Jesus (comp. vol. ii. p. 107). The oldest source placed there the long address which must have formed its first considerable speech-portion, and which, judging from its contents, must undoubtedly have belonged to this earlier period; and, moreover, it is represented as having been addressed to the followers of Jesus, who even then were very numerous.[1] It is in its amplification by the first

[1] The first evangelist employed this address *in* order to present at the outset a picture of the method of instruction followed by Jesus (Matt. v. 2–7, 27); the third simply inserted it where, according to Mark, Jesus ascended the mountain for the first time (comp. Luke vi. 12–19 with Mark iii. 7–19), without altering either the time or place where it occurred; for a level plain, on which the people could assemble, was only to be found upon the mountain, and not on the narrow border of the lake (Luke vi. 17). Both, however, considered it necessary to assume, for a speech of such significance, a circle of hearers larger than that formed by the followers of Jesus (Matt. v. 1; comp. Luke vi. 20). The third evangelist found it so represented in Mark (Luke vi. 17; comp. vii. 1), while the first, probably from his recollection of the same passage, brings it about through the gathering together *of people from* all quarters of the country (iv. 25; comp. vii. 28). That Jesus stood while healing the sick (Luke vi. 17 ff.) does not mean, of course, that He may not have sat down when He began to teach (Matt. v. 1). The first evangelist, following his usual plan, wove into the speech a number of smaller as well as larger groups of sayings, the historical connection of which, or their original independence, Luke has preserved from the oldest source from motives of perspicuity. Luke

evangelist (Matt. v. 7) that the speech is given so wide a range. Here and there the deliberate development of thought is so manifest that some have not unjustly doubted the extemporaneousness of the speech, and the possibility of its having been borne in the mind, as well as of its producing a unified impression. In this form it has become to a certain extent a kind of new promulgation of the law, which has been well called the *Magna Charta* of the kingdom of God, in so far as it deals in the greatest variety of ways with the righteousness of God's kingdom, although we are not justified in seeing in it the "inaugural address" to this kingdom, whose coming was by no means conditioned by the proclamation of new legal regulations. Luke, on the other hand, writing for the Gentile Christians, whom Paul had declared to be free from the law of Moses, left aside everything bearing upon the correct understanding of this law, or on its fulfilment by the Pharisees, which was unfamiliar to his readers, and has only retained the universal ethical statements of the speech, which he has, most significantly, classified under new points of view (Luke vi. 20–49).[1] But the original Sermon on the Mount as it is seen in the redaction of our two evangelists is as little a moral discourse as it is a new promulgation of the law; it is nothing but a proclamation of the kingdom of God, and such an one as makes it clear that the intention of Jesus, bearing, as it did, upon the historical situation, was to contrast the righteousness which should be wrought out in

has left out large portions of the speech, and thus effectually obliterated their chronological relations. Both the first and third evangelists, however, begin with the beatitudes and end with the parable of the building of the house, there being to a large extent verbal agreement in what is contained in the text; and we can neither think of these as two different speeches, nor suppose that we have to do with two independent and in many respects divergent traditions of the same speech. Both were undoubtedly formed upon the address in the apostolic source.

[1] The hypothesis that these had given them by Luke a reference to the destiny of the chosen apostle is disproved by the express separation he makes between it and the calling of the Twelve (in vi. 17–19), as well as by his statement regarding the hearers. The original form of the speech in the oldest source is, then, contained neither in the first nor in the third Gospel, but it can with great certainty be restored through the comparing together of the two redactions, especially as there lie in the historical relations of the speech the tests for an accurate critical restoration, as well as the security for its essential authenticity.

that kingdom with the revelation of God's will in the Old Testament, as well as with its synchronal exposition and fulfilment.

The followers of Jesus had assembled to hear the great Prophet speak of the kingdom of God and of the ideal which filled the soul of every holy Israelite, the realization of which He promised as being close at hand. Their expectation was not disappointed. But even on this occasion Jesus did not begin with theoretical comparisons regarding the nature of this kingdom or His method of bringing about its realization. His first words were beatitudes (Matt. v. 2) relating to those who belonged to this kingdom. He does not say that those who hear him are those blessed sons of men; but He describes the characteristics of those who have part in God's kingdom, so that His auditors might test themselves as to whether they belonged to the number of those who had a share in that kingdom. He does not attack their view of the kingdom of God, He does not discuss the question whether the fulness of earthly blessing and temporal benefits, which they expect to derive from it, shall come to pass or not; but He speaks of the spiritual benefits which form, in His view, what is essential in it, and calls on them to ask themselves whether they desire to have part in the kingdom which brings these benefits, and to feel happy in the possession of them, while He Himself counts them happy who do possess them.

The series of beatitudes He opens with a striking *oxymoron*. It does appear, indeed, as if man, in order to have a share in the kingdom of God, must possess certain qualifications, a certain amount of good disposition or of works with which God is well pleased. Yet no; "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 3). If this kingdom is first and mainly a kingdom of spiritual blessings, then only those who suffer from want of what belongs to the spiritual life can experience its blessedness and value what it bestows. The question here is not whether or no there are those who feel no such want; certainly if there be, they can have no eager desire for such a kingdom of God as Jesus will realize. This want must not only be felt, but must be felt acutely; only so can the supply of it be regarded as happiness. "Blessed are they that mourn, for

they, and they alone, shall be comforted" (Matt. v. 4). The consolation of Israel, for which all true saints were waiting (Luke ii. 25), and which they expected from the coming Messiah, was that at last the wrongs and wants of Israel would be put right, and it would become a people well-pleasing to God. This condition of being well-pleasing to God is represented in the Old Testament under the idea of righteousness. That is the highest good on which the whole safety of Israel depends, and along with which alone can there come the fulness of all other blessings. It must and shall be realized in the kingdom of God, just as the prophets had promised that it should be in the Messianic age (Isa. lviii. 8, lxi. 10). But only he who feels his need of this righteousness will desire to have it, and he only who desires will come in order to receive it in the kingdom of God. "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled" (Matt. v. 6). As Jesus did not call the righteous, but sinners, so He does not pronounce the righteous happy, but those who wish to become so. What they are seeking for, in order to realize this ideal, they will find in the kingdom of God, which they enter as disciples of Jesus; through the power of God's grace, which they daily receive and experience, will they become well-pleasing to God, and their greatest desire will be satisfied.[1]

There is still one proof available for the right estimation of that highest good which is to be bestowed in the kingdom of God,—are men prepared to suffer persecution on behalf of it? He who truly longs for righteousness, feeling painfully his

[1] That only these three beatitudes formed the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount is shown by Luke vi. 20 f., and from this it follows that those which the evangelist has added are of quite another kind; in them there is no mention made of the conditions under which a share is to be obtained in the kingdom of God now present, but of the distinctive peculiarities of the members of the kingdom, in view of the possession of which they may have a claim to the blessings of the perfected kingdom. With the proclamation of the blessedness of those who sorrow he connects that of the blessedness of the meek, because the experience of one's own need makes one tolerant of the errors of others; with the blessedness of the hungering he connects that of the merciful, because the experience of painful privation makes one able to sympathize. To the former he promises, according to Ps. xxxvii. 11, the possession of the perfected Messianic kingdom, to the latter the experience of mercy in the judgment, for even the subjects of the kingdom had need of clemency (v. 5, 7). In

need of this realization, will always in some way realize it in his life; and if he prefers to suffer persecution rather than give up what of righteousness he possesses, he shows that this is actually the highest object of his endeavour, and that he values the blessings of this world less than the highest good which is to be sought and found in the kingdom of God. The tried lovers of righteousness, therefore, are promised a share in the kingdom of heaven in a repetition of the first beatitude (Matt. v. 10). Even in the Psalms and prophetical writings of the Old Testament, the help of Jehovah, when He appeared in the time of salvation, had been promised to the oppressed. And just because of this the true saints in Israel hoped that, with the coming of the Messiah, or the setting up of the kingdom of God, an end would be put to a condition of things in which the just were oppressed and the godless triumphant. But Jesus knew that in the earthly realization of the kingdom of God, such as He was preparing the way for, righteousness had not yet attained to manifest dominance, because not appearing in the form of an earthly and victorious kingdom, and He knew, besides, that the members of it would then and afterwards suffer persecution. Indeed, insults and calumnies had already begun (Mark ii. 16, 18). His disciples required to hold themselves ready to suffer persecution on His account, and all the more as the opposition of the dominant classes to Him became greater. This is why He now turns directly to these His followers: "Blessed are ye when men revile you, and persecute you, and say all imaginable evil against you (falsely) for

order to complete the number of seven beatitudes, he promises, in accordance with Ps. xxiv. 3 f., that the pure in heart shall in the next world see God, and that to the peacemakers shall be granted the heavenly completion of their relation of sonship to God (v. 8 f.). It does not follow that these sayings, in as far as they are not mere echoes of Old Testament prophecies, were not handed down as spoken by Jesus; they cannot, however, rank with the three original beatitudes. It is Matthew alone who has retained those three in their original form; Luke has changed them into blessings directed towards the present subjects of the kingdom, on whom he makes the promises bear instead of on the future. He wished to take this opportunity of reminding his readers that the disciples of that time belonged to the poor, the hungry, and the sorrowing in this world, to whom there was promised, for the future life, the perfecting of the kingdom of God, the changing of their weeping into laughter of their privation into complete satisfaction.

my sake" (Matt. v. 11). So far were they to be from seeing in this suffering on account of Him an abatement of the blessedness which was promised to them along with participation in the kingdom of God, that they were rather to rejoice and exult, because there was thus given them the opportunity of proving themselves real members of the kingdom, the final realization of which is already securely reserved for them as their great reward in heaven. For the prophets, regarding whom no one doubts that, as the tried servants of God, they have a share in this heavenly reward, endured just such persecution as that which lies before them (v. 12).[1] The thought of a kingdom of God, within which there was still persecution to be endured, was certainly more difficult for the followers of Jesus to entertain than that of a kingdom in which the realization of righteousness was really attained. But they clung to His person, and Jesus, announcing Himself as Him on whose account they must present that offering, encourages them to make the sacrifice, and summons them to joyful constancy in view of the heavenly recompense. In this proclamation of the kingdom He stands forth, finally, as the founder of the kingdom of God, who is all in all to its subjects; and must not His disciples, therefore, have thought of the Messiah who was to bring the promised completion of salvation? But even this honourable position is not dependent upon the kingly crown and on the attributes of Messiahship in a politico-national sense, but on this, that He is the bringer and representative of the righteousness, on

[1] Luke has here also adopted only the direct address of Jesus to His disciples (vi. 22 f.), but he has defined with greater accuracy, in accordance with the experience of his time, the preface which is commonly preserved. Christians had already become the "odium humani generis," for the Jews had placed them under a ban, and it was a disgrace to bear the name. But even for Luke this short introduction to the speech was no longer sufficient, and to the four beatitudes he added four parallel lamentations concerning the rich, the satisfied, the merry, and those who are well-spoken of (vi. 24–26), which are recognisable as having been added by him from their being addressed to persons who were not present, and from the peculiarly Luke-like conception of the connection between riches and alienation from God. Even the remarks in Matt. v. 13–16, bearing on the calling of discipleship, and connected with the second half of the introduction, cannot belong to the Sermon on the Mount, carefully as they are there introduced, for the prophesied sufferings of His followers might have made them disloyal; in Luke xiv. 34 f., xi. 33, it is found in its original connection.

account of which the subjects of the kingdom must suffer persecution.

If the kingdom of God is concerned essentially with righteousness, Jesus must necessarily say what He means by it, and what His position is to the revelation of God in the Old Testament—a revelation which confined itself to teaching wherein consisted righteousness, or the course of life well-pleasing to God (comp. Deut. vi. 25). We have seen above how the thought was arrived at that new wine must be poured into new bottles (comp. vol. ii. p. 138). Precisely where consciousness of inadequacy in fulfilling the law had not yet penetrated deeply, could His promise of the realization of righteousness in the kingdom of God be easily understood as meaning that He wished by certain new performances to teach how to fulfil the will of Jehovah perfectly, and earn His favour (comp. Mark x. 17, 20). That, however, would be a simple abrogation of the Old Testament revelation of God's will: and it is not to be imagined that He has come in order to destroy the law, either in its Mosaic first principles or in its prophetic development. He has not come to destroy, but to fulfil. As the fundamental law of every healthy historical development is to introduce nothing negative, destructive, or revolutionary, but only what is creative, developing, conservative; so the Perfecter of the divine revelation of salvation, as contrasted with the preparative stages of revelation, cannot introduce a new element by which the old is to be abolished, but only one through which the latter will be realized in accordance with its true nature. He fulfils all prophetic prediction by bringing to completion God's preparation for salvation announced therein; He will accomplish in His own life the Old Testament revelation of God's will, as well as in the divine kingdom which He is to found, and in which the perfect fulfilment of the law by the subjects will bring about the realization of righteousness. Jesus solemnly affirms the inviolable validity of the divine law, from which neither the smallest letter nor the smallest portion of a letter can pass away so long as the world stands. It can only pass away in so far as, when the will of God contained in it is accomplished, it ceases to be mere law, and endures, not only in form, but as the

realized ordinance of God. For Him who came to fulfil the law in His own life, it had actually ceased to be law; His will and the divine will had become one; the latter no longer stood over against Him with a "Thou shalt," because Jesus performed it, saying: "I cannot do otherwise." The fulfilling of the whole law is of such importance to Him that He makes the distinction, which the individual obtains in the kingdom of God, to depend upon his attitude towards what are apparently the least commandments in the law. The law is an organic whole, and the fulfilment of it, which is to bring the kingdom of God, is only understood by him who knows how to estimate the connection between the whole and the particular, and permits it to take its right place in the proper fulfilment taught by Jesus. He who mistakes this connection, and begins to destroy, even in the smallest degree, shows a spiritual immaturity which will allow to him, even in the kingdom of God, very slender distinction; he, however, who understands the past, understands also the present, and knows how to find out even in it what is right in doctrine and in life (Matt. v. 17–19). An unhistorical age, which neither understood the Old Testament nor the New, has doubted whether we have here actual sayings of Jesus, or not rather the crass misunderstanding of an epoch which has placed its Jewish-Christian pretensions in the mouth of the Master. So far as regards the historical method of treatment, it is simply inconceivable that a son of Israel, who desired to be the Messiah of His people, could have begun by representing Himself as opposed in any way to the Old Testament law, which He, along with His people, regarded as the proclamation of the divine will. When the rich man asked Him what he must do in order to make sure of eternal life, Jesus referred him to the commands of God, enumerating what are merely Old Testament injunctions (Mark x. 19; comp. Luke x. 25 f., 28). And when, at the end of His life, He hurled His most fully charged denunciations in the face of the scribes of His time, He directed His disciples to do and keep all that these men, as expounders of the law of Moses, taught them (Matt. xxiii. 2 f.).[1] He only taught men to

[1] In later times men have acknowledged this protest of Jesus against the breaking of the law by arbitrarily placing a meaning upon the realization which

understand the Old Testament revelation of God's will in its whole range and in all its depth, and, according to this comprehension of it, promoted the fulfilment of the divine will.

It was thus possible for Jesus to speak of an entirely new realization of righteousness in the kingdom of God, which should take place through an essentially new teaching and observance of the law. For He certainly recognised that the fulfilment of law, as the scribes of His time taught and the Pharisees practised it, was utterly insufficient. If the righteousness of His disciples did not far exceed theirs, they would never enter the kingdom of God, in which true righteousness was to obtain realization (Matt. v. 20). For these men attached themselves to the external form of the law, which was its transitory part, and must in the true fulfilment fall away of itself. In accordance with the stages of Old Testament revelation, the holy will of God was revealed in it, not for the most part in an eternal and universally applicable manner, but in the form of a popular and judicial law, which should regulate the civil and religious life of a single nation, and become outgrown through its fulfilment by men. Such a law had to reckon with the fact of man's empirical sinfulness, with his legal organization, and with the conditions of his national life. So long as the doctrine of the scribes and the actual fulfilment of the law clung to this form, so long had it the letter of the law in its favour, and the intention of the lawgiver opposed to it. In spite of this form of the law, which contained indications pointing in a

really transcends the perfection of fulfilment. But the expression regarding the imperishable permanence of the law, of which even the Paulinist Luke is aware, and to which he knows how to accommodate himself (xvi. 17), is, by these men, either explained as referring to its permanence until the kingdom of God should be set up, while an attempt is made to prove the existence, in the course of development of Jesus' ministry, of a gradual dissolution at least of the ceremonial portion of the law, or else it is given up as being a Jewish-Christian interpolation. Lastly, the remark about him who is least in the kingdom of God is explained as being a Jewish-Christian polemic against the Apostle Paul, who made no reference to isolated regulations in the law, but represented believers, who have received the Spirit of Christ, as being dead to the whole law (Gal. ii. 19); because, as in the case of Christ Himself, what the law requires will be fulfilled in them through the agency of the Spirit, and without an external law (Rom. viii. 4). But Jesus never made a distinction between portions of the law, holding, as He did, the law in its entirety to be a revelation of the divine will.

different direction, Jesus teaches men to recognise in it the revelation of the absolute will of God, not in order to impose the form of an external law on the community of His disciples, for no earthly community, in which sin is still present, could endure such a law, but in order to establish it as the goal to which the realization of the perfected will of God in His kingdom should progressively approach. It is on this understanding that He develops in what follows, by means of a few examples, the way in which, according to His view, the will of God revealed in the law is to be understood and fulfilled. He does not, as has with incomprehensible perversity been imagined, carry on a contest with the law, which He always pronounced inviolable; He does not even struggle against Pharisaic glosses and distortions. What His followers have heard from the mouth of the doctors of the law, in the reading and exposition in the synagogues, and what had from of old been declared to the fathers, is expressly embraced in the letter of the law, or can be accurately inferred from it. But He contends against the view that, in this letter of the law, which was adjusted to concrete relations, the perfect and universally applicable will of God is exhaustively contained. Jesus was conscious of understanding only the deepest intention of the divine Lawgiver, when with His "But I say unto you," He brings to the front, like a *dictator*, the way in which the divine will is to be fulfilled in the perfected theocracy, in the kingdom of God (v. 21–48).

In six divisions, Jesus brings clearly into view the antagonism between His conception of the law and that of the scribes. The statutes of the Old Testament forbid murder and adultery, because it is sinful deeds alone which can be recognised and punished. When the traditionary legal teaching added to the fifth commandment (Ex. xx. 13) the gloss that the murderer should be handed over to the local authority which applied the criminal law (Deut. xxi. 19), there was no objection to be urged against that. In prohibiting murder, the law did not pass a theoretical sentence upon what was morally unallowable, but it proposed to hand over to justice the deed which it forbade. But when men knew not how to add anything to this prohibition except this

committal to the legal court, which could place at its bar the external act alone, they indulged the delusion that the divine prohibition is directed only against the external sinful act. But Jesus shows that in the kingdom of God, where all are brethren through the fatherly love of God, which has come down to them, the feeling of anger, out of which murder proceeds, is punishable equally with it; and He represents, further, the ordinary method of procedure which refers crimes of like degree to the same tribunal, and more heinous offences to a higher court, as well as how he who gives place to wrath, and thereby utters words of abuse and slander, is far more culpable (Matt. v. 21 f.).[1] The case is the same in regard to adultery. Certainly Jesus has no objection that the sixth commandment should be strongly enforced in the traditional legal teaching (Ex. xx. 14), for that commandment bears only upon the gross sinful act, which alone can be taken cognizance of by the law and punished (comp. Lev. xx. 10). But, before God, adulterous desire is the same as adultery, *i.e.* it merits punishment just as much as does the latter. If a married man so far yields to the impure desire which is filling him as to allow his eyes to rest upon the wife of another, he has already, in his heart, proved unfaithful to his own wife, and is just as worthy of punishment as an adulterer (Matt. v. 27 f.).[2] In this case it is quite clear

[1] Jesus therefore refers an angry thought to the same tribunal as murder, and the simple words of abuse of everyday life to the supreme tribunal which deals the heaviest punishments to the most heinous crimes. And since above the highest human court there stands the divine tribunal in which one punishment only is recognised, he who gives utterance to insulting words against his brother will suffer in hell the fire of divine wrath. Jesus does not wish, therefore, to establish a new resort for the subjects of the kingdom, He will not distinguish between offences for which human punishment is sufficient, and those which deserve the divine; but He desires to show how the angry word which falls so easily from men is before God more deserving of punishment than the angry feeling which is kept back from expression, although in itself this must be regarded as being equal to the great sin of murder, and as deserving of the heaviest penalty. In regard to all this, then, the degree of punishment cannot be computed. The proper position for the remark in v. 25 f. is plainly Luke xii. 58 f., where alone it possesses any visible concord; so, too, must v. 23 f. be one of Jesus' utterances which was introduced by the evangelist; but both are intended to show how, since anger is such a culpable thing, any one who has roused it must do all in his power to soothe his irritated brother.

[2] The remark in v. 29 f. treats of what is to be done by the subjects of the

that Jesus simply explains the intention of the lawgiver as being in accordance with the spirit of the tenth commandment (Ex. xx. 17).

To this second remark Jesus adds yet a third, referring to the sacred observance of the marriage tie. When the teachers of the law required a man who put away his wife to give her a formal dismissal through a legal document in the form of a deed of separation, this was quite regular and in accordance with the law itself (Deut. xxiv. 1). It is incorrect to say that they had curtailed the law by leaving out the ground of divorce; for what is described in this passage by an obscure expression whose actual meaning has always given rise to controversy, was even by the strictest construction of a most flexible character, and in any case so dependent upon the man's subjective condition, that it was not a ground of divorce in the judicial sense, and was therefore not entered in the deed of separation. But when the lawgiver assumes that the divorces unfortunately occurring among a sinful people (comp. Mark x. 5) should at least be granted according to legal forms, which Jesus would have no desire whatever to alter, this did not mean that divorce in itself was right before God. When Jesus declares that every man who puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery, as also he who marries her who is put away, He gives it to be understood that in the eye of God the marriage with her who is divorced still continues, and therefore, according to the perfect will of God, cannot be dissolved (Matt. v. 31 f.). He afterwards laid great emphasis upon how He discovered that this divine will was given expression to in the Old Testament, and also how in this case He was only explaining the law in accordance with the lawgiver's most profound intention (Mark x. 6–9).[1]

kingdom when in spite of themselves evil desires are aroused. But we shall later meet with the same remark in its original connection in Matt. xviii. 8 f., where, notwithstanding its striking symbolism, it is secure against all misconception.

[1] The form of Jesus' remarks against remarriage, Luke has preserved in the original, xvi. 18, for, according to Mark x. 11 f., Mark was unaware of any change in them. In order to gain a direct prohibition of divorce, the first evangelist so turned the words that it seemed as if whoever put away his wife, acquiring apparently thereby a right to remarry, committed adultery. On this

The Old Testament theocracy, like every other institution tainted with sin, had such need of oaths and of the law of requital, that the law of the Old Covenant could only command that the oath be not broken, and that penal justice should be exercised in righteousness. The words in which the scribes endeavoured to inculcate the obligation of certain oaths (Matt. v. 33) are certainly not to be found in Holy Writ; but they can indirectly be deduced from Old Testament passages (Lev. xix. 12; Num. xxx. 3), and decisively prohibit false-swearing and perfidy,—a prohibition from which Jesus did assuredly not detract. The subtle distinctions which they drew between oaths sworn in the name of Jehovah Himself and all other kinds, Jesus quietly removes by the reflection, that even the latter are fundamentally oaths in God's name; for heaven and earth can only be appealed to as witnesses in so far as the one is God's throne and the other His footstool (Isa. lxvi. 1), and the Holy City, Jerusalem, in so far as it is the city of the great King of the theocracy (Ps. xlviii. 8); it is only possible to swear by the head—one hair of which no one can make black or white—in so far as a man calls down God's punishment for perjury upon his own head. What Jesus contrasts with this statement of the law is the fact of oaths being in reality derived from sin: it is the dominion of falsehood and infidelity, as well as the mistrust caused by them, which make oaths necessary. In the kingdom of God, therefore, where truth and fidelity obtain dominion, oaths must disappear, and in their place will be put the most simple of affirmations, compelling the greatest credence (v. 34–37).[1]

account he adds the exceptional case in which, when a man divorces his wife because of fornication, he does not then cause her to sin, for she is an adulteress already. Certainly the evangelist did not think of a ground for divorce as we mean it, and still less did Jesus, who in every case assumes it as self-evident that before God there is no such thing as divorce, and who only brands remarriage as adultery in order that even in the case of entire putting away the path to reconciliation, and so to the accomplishment of the divine will, shall remain open.

[1] As little as the kingdom of God realizes itself in an earthly community, so little did Jesus desire to attack the lawfulness of the usually required oath, which He Himself had taken without any misgiving (Mark xiv. 61 f.); but He pointed out how with the realization of the divine will the need for oaths would disappear.

Even the Old Testament law (Ex. xxi. 24) had enunciated the fundamental principle that requital dare not be more than an equivalent for the crime that has been committed, —an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth (Matt. v. 38); and this must always be so. But the Old Testament itself was no mere system of laws, although it prohibited revenge and retaliation among the subjects of the kingdom (Lev. xix. 18; Prov. xx. 22, 24, 29; comp. Lam. iii. 30 with Matt. v. 39). Jesus acted, therefore, quite in the manner of the Old Testament lawgiver, when He showed by a series of examples how the complete divine will, which is to be realized in the kingdom of God, requires that patient self-sacrificing love shall renounce all prosecution.[1] We are certainly justified in striving to ward off abuse. But that cannot happen unless violence is done towards a neighbour. Jesus says, therefore, "Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Resistance encourages; gentleness, which is prepared to endure everything, disarms the opponent; we would be within our right in demanding atonement for shameful ill-treatment, but it is our loving duty to bring our neighbour to acknowledge his fault through shame. The second example exhibits the intention of the antagonist to proceed by law against his neighbour, so that because of a pretended debt he may seize his under garment. This is the usual way taken by an antagonist to get his claim allowed. But rather than it should become a question at law, a disciple of Jesus should give him more than he could hope to win through a law plea, even to the precious and indispensable cloak. A law plea might be gained, but that would be to make the embittered adversary doubly an enemy. Through the sacrifice of both garments it is possible to win a heart which is conquered by the force of such love; but even the just claim is not thereby renounced, for the supplement shows that this is not done under compulsion. The third example presents rather the manner in which the neighbour offends;

[1] He does not discuss the question when and whether consideration of the objective possessions of common life, or even of the possible hardening of the offender in wickedness, may make such prosecution a duty; He demands categorically a state of mind ready for any sacrifice and any exercise of meek endurance, because in these cases only such a state of mind can teach what is right.

he commands where he ought to petition. And even if a few steps only should be in question, our sense of justice rises in revolt at being required to render a service which we are under no obligation to do. Yet, in spite of all, the disciple of Jesus follows, for instead of one mile he accompanies the insolent oppressor two. He might boast of his right, and refuse to do the benefit demanded; but by doing more than is required, he shows in a thoroughly disconcerting way that affection does not need compulsion before it performs a service. It is the nature of all true affection to renounce what is nothing more than a legal right. It does not even ask a petitioner whether there is any legal call to give, but it gives; even one who desires to borrow (of course without interest, for that is prohibited in Ex. xxii. 24) it does not dismiss, although no one lies under an obligation to lend (Matt. v. 39–42). Where such love dominates, as is required by the divine will, the need for rules and regulations ceases, just as oaths disappear where truth and fidelity prevail; through it wrong is far more effectually subdued and made impossible for the future, than by the requital which is threatened by law.

This leads of itself to the last portion of the exposition of the law. Jesus had pronounced love to God and our neighbour to be the radical principle of the law, upon which all isolated definitions depended (Matt. xxii. 37–40); any consideration of single commands, therefore, must always come back to this commandment, which itself needs careful discernment. In the law as it stood there was certainly nothing to alter or improve (Lev. xix. 18); for man, as he is by nature, there can be no higher or truer standard for love to his neighbour than his esteem for himself. The addition made by the scholarship of that age: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy" (Matt. v. 45), is the one comment cited by Jesus from another source than Holy Scripture, and it presents the distinct characteristics, in its exclusiveness towards the surrounding nations, of post-exilian Judaism; but even this statement cannot be said to be contrary to the sense of the Old Testament.[1] The wall of partition separating

[1] That the scribes had a private enemy in view is inconceivable, for this is not permission to hate, it is a command to do so, which could only

Israel from the Gentiles had, in the providence of God, fallen greatly into disrepair; and Jesus did not think it worth making an effort to pull it completely down (comp. Luke x. 36). Just as little, however, was it His intention to teach the love towards one's personal enemies, so impressively commanded by the Old Testament, and there touchingly represented (comp. Ex. xxiii. 4 f.; Prov. xxiv. 17, xxv. 21; Job xxxi. 29; comp. Ps. vii. 5).[1] He laid particular emphasis on the fact that the natural affection, which is really mutual love, and is restricted in its demonstrations to relatives and compatriots, is also to be found in publicans and Gentiles, and, when looked at from an ethical point of view, is absolutely worthless (Matt. v. 46 f.); this He did in order to indicate how the affection which unites the subjects of the kingdom as brothers and as sons of God, does not yet surpass this natural affection (v. 11). It was not without a purpose that He had previously spoken of the contrast between those who confessed His name and their persecutors (v. 11). This opposition, profound as the religious difference dividing Israel from the surrounding peoples, and which might so easily appear to create a gulf as impassable as the wall of partition by which the Old Testament separated Israel from the Gentiles, was, in God's good providence, to be bridged over by love which would henceforth be boundless. In place of giving a list of proofs of affection, Jesus, according to the original text, mentions only one; for they who can pray for their enemies can accomplish the rest. "I say unto you,

have reference to a national enemy; and besides, it is opposed to numerous statements in the Old Testament, which even the scribes could not overlook. But however abrupt was the expression given to this commandment, or however passionate its fulfilment, it must not be supposed that it had no point of contact in the Old Testament. It is true, as the parallelism shows, that the commandment of love (Lev. xix. 18) had exclusive application to the nation. The duties towards humanity did not extend to foreigners (Deut. xv. 3, xxiii. 21). It was involved in the conditions of the Israelitish national life, that if the nation was to be kept pure from any intermixture of heathenish confusion, a rugged wall of separation had to be erected through the Old Testament law between Israel and the surrounding nations (Deut. vii. 1–5).

[1] The idea, which is still too prevalent, that Jesus was the first to indoctrinate love to one's neighbour, or at least love to one's enemy, and that this was probably the main theme of His teaching, is founded not only upon an entirely unhistorical and modern moralizing conception of His ministry, but also upon total ignorance of the Old Testament.

Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you" (Matt. v. 44).

At this point Jesus could not stop; now was the time therefore to present a new law, telling in what this new righteousness consisted, which was to be realized in the kingdom of God through the full accomplishment of the divine will. It was necessary for Him to point out how the promise of the realization of righteousness with which He began (v. 6) was to be fulfilled. Prohibitions of anger and impure desires, of the untruthfulness which makes oaths necessary, and even of legal proceedings, may perhaps influence a man, but cannot make him show love to his enemies and persecutors. Something new must be created in him from above, and this is what is done in the subjects of the kingdom. A subject in this realm has become a son of God, *i.e.* an object of His paternal affection; and the son cannot do otherwise than try to resemble his father. Jesus does not say that it will be so; He assumes it as self-evident and as manifestly necessary, and only points out the way for its attainment. Through love to his enemies, it is possible for a man to become a son of God, for the heavenly Father Himself permits His sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and rain to fall upon the just and unjust (Matt. v. 45). It has been thought surprising that Jesus did not mention the far greater love which God manifested by sending the Messiah to His people; but this is to forget that this mission, although all-embracing in its purpose, was actually participated in by subjects of the kingdom only. The reanimating light of the sun, however, shines on all alike, and the refreshing rain is poured forth on all. And Jesus had not really forgotten the new revelation which appeared in Him when He brought the promised salvation to Israel, and established the kingdom of God, in which each member was assured of God's fatherly affection. It is to this revelation of God's supreme affection, which is now recognised as being the true divine perfection, that Jesus referred to when closing His exhortations to His disciples: "Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). This is Jesus' final and greatest exposition of the law, the sum of what may be gathered from the law of the Old Covenant in the light of the New. For it is impossible to mistake the allusion to the

fundamental commandment of the Old Testament: "Ye shall be holy; for I am holy" (Lev. xi. 44 f.). In place of the divine holiness, *i.e.* of God's exaltation above the impurity of created beings, is the positive conception of the divine perfection, whose nature is all-embracing, self-sacrificing love. And in place of the God, for ever separated from His polluted people by His holiness, to whom they can only render themselves worthy of approach through the most anxious abstinence from all impurity, and by means of the statutes for purification contained in the law, there is on the ground of this new revelation the Father in heaven, who stoops to His children in love, and so operates that they must and can be like Him. But even this was no renovation or improvement of the law, but was its true interpretation in the sense of the Lawgiver, whose most profound intention Jesus read in His own commission.[1]

Jesus' antithesis was not only directed against the scribes' exposition of the law, but also against the Pharisees' manner of fulfilling it (Matt. v. 20). The fundamental error of the latter consisted in their obeying the law for the sake of man, and not having regard to God alone. Their conception of the law, according to which righteousness consisted essentially in the punctilious observance of each several ordinance bearing upon external life, rendered this ostentation possible; the way in which the observance of the law had become a party question, and the position and importance of each individual, dependent upon how far he seemed to be a true representative of the party, must necessarily have provoked this. But any fulfilment of the divine will having this secondary aim, is morally worthless, it cannot earn divine

[1] Luke has correctly recognised how Jesus' exposition of the law reaches its height in His explanation of the command to love; as a commandment he omits it, and gives what is said concerning love to one's enemies in a finished form (Luke vi. 27 f.), adding what he can of the sentences referring to tender-hearted, patient, and self-sacrificing love (ver. 29 f.). He represents the remarks about the affection possessed by sinners in a peculiarly complete way, and enriched by new examples (vv. 32-34), in order that he may come back to love to one's enemies according to God's example (ver. 35 f.). It is manifest from certain details that the original speech is not only more completely preserved in Matthew, but that his account is more faithful than that of Luke, where interest for the inculcation and direct application of the words of Jesus there preserved is everywhere manifest.

satisfaction and the heavenly reward accompanying it, because it seeks and receives as its reward honour in the eyes of men (Matt. vi. 1). If this be so in regard to the fulfilment of the law, it is true in a greater degree of those virtuous practices in which it had long been thought possible to see an especial proof of piety, and therefore a super-legal righteousness in regard to alms, prayers, and fastings (comp. Tob. xii. 9). In what is almost word for word a counterpart of these three divisions, Jesus exposes most impressively the worthlessness of such righteousness, and contrasts it with the genuine proof of piety, carried out in secret because there is no thought of being seen by men, and which will assuredly therefore be rewarded by God who alone sees in secret. The fact of Jesus not sparing the Pharisees in this polemic is of significance as showing the position He then held to the party. He depicted drastically, almost ironically, these hypocritical patterns of virtue, who in all the demonstrations of piety, which are apparently intended to secure God's good pleasure, only see to it that they shall be seen of men. As the sound of the trumpet precedes him who plays, and announces his coming, just so do they seek to make a show and disturbance with their boastful almsgiving in the synagogues and streets, while true benevolence gives secretly, so that the left hand does not know what is done by the right (vi. 2–4). In the synagogues where many eyes are upon them, they place themselves where the fervour of their devotions may be well seen, and at the corners of the streets where the traffic is greatest they allow themselves to be overtaken by the hour of prayer, that their punctiliousness in the observance of the same may be proved before the eyes of all; but the genuine worshipper enters his closet, that he may avoid being intruded on through curiosity (vi. 5 f.). When they fast, they assume a doleful mien, and so cover themselves with ashes as hardly to be recognisable, in order that all shall see it is with them a day of fasting. But whoever fasts from an inward desire, will show it so little to men as to appear like one preparing himself for a feast (vi. 16–18).[1]

[1] What is said as to the true meaning of prayer in contrast to heathen babbling is entirely foreign to the tendency of this section, and the same may be said of

The other side of this Pharisaic pride of virtue, which flaunts its pious offices before men, presents that insolent judging of others which looks with satisfaction upon the sins and shortcomings that throw their own worth into clearer relief (comp. Luke xviii. 12), and the apparently holy zeal with which they feign to produce the accomplishment of God's law among the people while really labouring for the predominance of their own party. As the true practice of righteousness can only be for the sake of God, it must also be done in all humility in the consciousness of personal failing, which does not exalt itself over others. In regard to this point also Jesus did not consider it requisite to secure His statement against misconception, as if He desired to defend the judication which His calling made a duty, or to limit in any way the justice of a moral condemnation. But uncalled-for tracing of strange faults and loveless verdicts against our neighbour, He threatens with a like judgment, and He calls to mind how the thought of being so dealt with by God must render any one averse to censuring who is conscious of his own frailties (Matt. vii. 1 f.). People deceive themselves when they try and palliate such censoriousness by the pretext that they are zealous for offended justice, or have in view the improvement of their neighbour. He of whom this was really true would be the first to perceive far greater shortcomings in himself; but pride has only an eye for the petty weaknesses of others and for improvement in their case; for all pretended zeal for goodness is hypocritical, and is really derived from the love of fault-finding and criticizing in which a man reflects himself. This same pride, however, which only sees the faults of others and never its own, is constantly disposed to ask what a man's neighbour owes him, but never what he is indebted to his neighbour. The Pharisees required honour and recognition from all; but they never suspected that others had any claim upon them. Just as strange faults are most easily seen, so, on the other hand, is personal need first

the model prayer, showing evidently that chap. vi. 7–15 does not belong to this place, a fact which is confirmed by Luke xi. 1–4, where the occasion when Jesus gave this model prayer is still historically preserved. The section vi. 19–34 is also preserved in Luke xii. 22–34 in its original connection, and is first incorporated in the Sermon on the Mount through Matt. vi. 33, where the reference to the righteousness of the kingdom of God is introduced.

perceived—what is required of others and what is the duty of the community. This is why Jesus says, All things, therefore, ye would that men should do to you, even so do ye also to them. As a proverb this was probably well known both among the Jews and Gentiles, but it was in a negative form as a maxim of frigid egotism, which abstained from all inimical action in order to guard against hurt. In the mouth of Jesus it expresses the sublimest principle of all ethical association, according to which every man must recognise another as possessing an equal right, and so make his personal need the standard of duty towards his neighbour. Even the Old Testament teaches how the duty of affection is to be calculated by ordinary self-esteem (Lev. xix. 18); and as Jesus afterwards said that all the other commandments depended upon this one (Matt. xxiii. 40), He says here that this rule contains the law and the prophets, *i.e.* the entire Old Testament revelation of God's will, and that He Himself only desires to show how God's will can be perfectly fulfilled (vii. 12). The great want of humanity is love; and whoever gives to others the affection his own needy heart craves, has truly fulfilled the whole law.[1]

The theme of the sermon is manifestly exhausted when Jesus so expressly returns to the issue of His explanations (comp. v. 17). But as it had a solemn prologue, it was also furnished with an epilogue. Was its aim to distinguish between the fulfilling of the law as Jesus was to bring it about in the kingdom of God, and the fulfilment of the law as taught and exercised by the actual leaders of the people, then

[1] That the original Sermon on the Mount contained Matt. vii. 1–5 is manifest from Luke vi. 37 f., where the first two remarks are greatly amplified, and were perhaps completed under the reminiscences of other sayings, preserved by tradition, which give the same thought in somewhat different form, as well as from vi. 41 f., where the second half occurs almost word for word. Even the saying in Matt. vii. 12, which is almost certainly original, and from which Luke had naturally to omit the reference to the exposition of the law, causing it thereby to lose its significance as a concluding remark, he endeavoured to introduce in another connection in vi. 31. On the other hand, the remark which from another side exhibits the limits of this new zeal for improvement (Matt. vii. 6), and the series of sayings (vii. 7–11) which in this connection probably refer to prayer for others in cases where the presuppositions for attempts at self-improvement are lacking, and of which Luke probably still possesses the original connection (Luke xi. 9–13), cannot possibly have been originally in this place.

it must necessarily close with a warning against these false teachers. Even here, however, they are not mentioned by name; Jesus refers to them in a parable: Is it possible for one blind man to show another the way? Shall they not both fall into the ditch (Luke vi. 39)? But more than this, such guides are, in truth, not leaders, but misleaders of the people. However brilliant they may appear, adorned with their apparently holy exercises of piety, they are really ravening wolves enveloped in sheep's clothing; because in order to satisfy their passion for dominion, by their misleading they plunge the people into destruction (Matt. vii. 15). By their fruits shall they be known. As surely as every plant bears fruit only after its kind, and as a good tree bears good fruit, will it be manifest from their outward, arrogant, and apparently holy virtues that their conception of the law is false and their doctrine wrong (vii. 16–18). Jesus' followers, therefore, ought to avoid them, and select the one true Teacher and Guide whom God has sent to them. But it is necessary not only to recognise Him as the true Teacher, but to follow Him and to perform the will of the Father in heaven, as Jesus teaches how it is to be accomplished (vii. 21). And so He passes to the magnificent parable which forms the conclusion of the sermon (vv. 24–27).[1] He only who

[1] Luke alone has preserved the parable with which the epilogue began; for that it was not originally in this place is shown by Matt. xv. 14, where it has been arbitrarily introduced into the text of Mark. Luke, by conjoining with it (vi. 40) the remark in Matt. x. 24, makes it the conclusion to a second portion of the Sermon on the Mount, in which it is shown how one can help another to salvation. He introduces what is said about the mote (ver. 41 f.), as well as the parable of the tree and its fruits, only that he may interweave a similar incident from Matt. ii. 33 ff. (vv. 43–45) in order to pass by means of the fundamental thought of Matt. vii. 31 (Luke vi. 46) to the closing parable (vi. 47–49). Corresponding with the more comprehensive meaning which, through his additions, he gives to the Sermon on the Mount, the first evangelist has formed the introduction to the epilogue from what was said of the strait gate and narrow way (vii. 13 f.), whose original connection we shall find in Luke xiii. 24 ff. Although probable in itself, it is quite uncertain whether Jesus really described the teachers of His day as false prophets (Matt. vii. 15), for in what follows the evangelist clearly employs words from the same connection (Luke xiii. 26 f.) in order to refer them to the false prophets of his own age (vii. 22 f.). Chap. vii. 19 also is clearly an addition adopted from the speech of the Baptist (iii. 10), and from which the evangelist, by means of a literal repetition of the beginning (vii. 16), considers himself necessitated to return to the connection (ver. 20).

listens to Jesus' words and follows them, is like unto the wise man who built his house upon a rock. The rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not; for it was founded upon the rock. With solemn uniformity a contrasting picture is drawn of the house, built by a foolish man upon the sand, which did not stand the test. So also the test for the disciple will be whether, not only in hearing, but also in action, the words of Jesus are approved. Even here imagination has been rife, seeing in the storms and floods, which are indeed the natural conditions by which the strength of a house is tested, reminiscences of the sights presented by a "Galilean spring," and explaining it as a harbinger of approaching storms. It may well be asked, however, whether this magnificent parable with which His great speech closed, may to Jesus not have admitted of another interpretation than what He Himself gave.

This meaning can certainly not be understood by any one who regards the Sermon on the Mount as a collection of moral axioms, which point to the hidden meaning from the outward action, or as containing the sum of Christianity according to Jesus' purpose and design. His teaching of how God's law was to be understood and fulfilled certainly differed from that of His time; but all that He here purposed was to disclose the Lawgiver's profound meaning, for the correct apprehension of which the Old Testament contained sufficient indications. This was no new law which, the more profound and comprehensive were its demands, must have seemed impracticable to pious souls. He therefore began with the promise of a righteousness which even those who most sincerely long for it would not create in themselves (v. 6), and this is why, at the height of His argument, He shows how a subject of the kingdom attains to this fulfilment (v. 45). In this way He established the kingdom of God in which the divine will is to be perfectly realized. The Sermon on the Mount is ultimately a message from the kingdom of God; for it shows that the kingdom can only be established through the realization of righteousness. The people, and even His own followers, expected differently. He was first of all to establish the kingdom of Israel in earthly splendour; when

that was done, they would willingly serve God, attired in a new righteousness. Jesus did not here destroy their hope of the politico-national future which all the prophets had promised. But He would not build this house of their future hopes upon the sand. There was only one rock upon which it could be immoveably erected for all time, and that was the regeneration of the people and the establishment of the kingdom of God in spirit and in truth; for this Jesus laboured at the realization of genuine righteousness among the people. Divine wisdom declares, even in the Old Testament, that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is the destruction of the people (Prov. xiv. 34).

# CHAPTER XI.

## THE LEPER.

ONE of the most frightful scourges of the East is the disease of leprosy, which is indigenous in Egypt as well as in Palestine. The complaint first shows itself in tiny reddish spots or scurvy-like eruptions, afterwards boils and ulcers are developed, which lacerate the epidermis, and slowly but surely the malady goes deeper, seizes upon one organ after another, until perhaps after the lapse of years consumption and dropsy supervene. It was not only a natural loathing of this foul disease, but also the danger of contagion, which was the more to be dreaded, as the taint was often transmitted through four generations, which moved the Lawgiver to promulgate the most careful rules for the diagnosis of leprosy. Proceeding upon those, it was the duty of the priests, occupying as they did the office of sanitary inspectors, to declare unclean any so afflicted (comp. Lev. xiii.). The sufferer was obliged to avoid the towns, and to go about with torn garments, bared head, and covered chin. Uncertainty prevails as to how far it was possible to exclude those unfortunates from all intercourse with other men; a place was set aside for them even in the synagogues, although the strictest precautionary measures were taken. If the sufferer recovered, he was obliged to submit, under the direction of the priests, to prolonged ceremonies of purification, and not till after the presentation of the legal offering was pronounced clean (comp. Lev. xiv.).

The oldest source tells of a leper who came to Jesus simply because he had heard of other lepers being cured (comp. Matt. xi. 5), and who, throwing himself down with every expression of homage, declared that his being cleansed depended only upon Jesus' will in the matter. Stretching forth His hand, Jesus touched him, saying, I will; be thou

made clean. But when directly afterwards the health-bringing action had commenced, Jesus forbade him to behave as if cured, or even to tell of it, until he had shown himself to the priest, and had been admitted by him to the performance of the legal sacrifice, which of course could only be presented by one who was clean, and which in the eyes of all was an attestation of the fact (Matt. viii. 2–4). It was certainly very probable that the sick man, on recovering his health in so unusual a way, thought himself absolved from the toilsome and costly legal obligations. The importance attached to this narrative by the oldest source, was evidently not owing to the miracle of healing alone, but rather to the confirmation therein afforded of its predicate that Jesus had not come to disturb the regulations of the law (v. 17).[1] According to the connection in which it stands in Mark (comp. i. 39 f.), it seems to have been in one of the synagogues that the sick man approached Jesus. We also learn here that although Jesus compassionately allowed it, yet He drove the man out with threats as soon as the cure had taken place; from which we perceive that although the oldest source contents itself with affirming the immediate cure (Matt. viii. 3), and Mark simply follows its leading, yet the process of healing was only then actually begun, and the danger of contagion was as great as ever (comp. vol. ii. p. 96).[2]

Apart from the miracle of healing, the significance of the narrative, as far as we are concerned, consists in its showing incontrovertibly that the recognition of the law in the Sermon on the Mount included the ceremonial part as well. This fact is perfectly fatal to the theory which holds that the principal object of Jesus' ministry was to spiritualize the worship of God, and free it from all ceremonial non-essentials.

[1] The oldest source seems to have placed the narrative directly after the Sermon on the Mount, for it has the first place in the first evangelist's great description of Jesus' ministry of healing, and is the first incident of this ministry incorporated by Mark (i. 40–45). It is true the latter did not apprehend correctly the precise tendency of Jesus' prohibition (comp. vol. ii. p. 97 f.), for Jesus by no means meant to forbid a cure being proclaimed which had taken place before the eyes of many, and Mark himself testifies how far this end was from being attained.

[2] This narrative was pronounced by Strauss to be simply an imitation of the legends of the prophets in the Old Testament, although really there does not exist a single analogous example, for the curing of the leprous Naaman

It has been said, indeed, that at that time Jesus Himself was not perfectly clear whether He would require to break with the traditional form of worship, and that He desired nothing more than to avoid conflict with the supreme authorities, by refraining from every appearance of damaging existing institutions. But in the account of the ten lepers, which, judging from its position, belonged to a later period in His ministry, Jesus gives what is exactly the same command (Luke xvii. 14), showing that this was a necessary legal proceeding. The idea of His taking up a freer attitude towards the law in the course of the continuous development of His activity, and of His releasing the disciples, although not the people, from certain merely ceremonial precepts, is utterly irreconcilable with the principle enunciated in Matt. v. 17–19, and such a fact would have been employed against Him by His opponents in a very different way than was actually done. Indeed, the position taken up towards the law by the early Church is a proof of its possessing no word of Jesus that released them from their obligation to the law, or even to any part of it. It cannot be said that the case of the leper had no other bearing than a wise sanitary measure, for to ensure its being obeyed there was no necessity whatever for the inculcation of the duty of offering sacrifice.

Sacrifice, however, is the true recognition of the central principle of the law on its ceremonial side. Indeed, Jesus began His ministry by protecting the Old Testament sanctuary from desecration, and He describes it, quite in the Old Testament sense, as His Father's house (John ii. 16; comp. Matt. xxiii. 21). It is from John we learn that Jesus repeatedly went up to the feasts; and if He did that, He could not

(2 Kings v.) differs in every particular. The older Rationalism regarded it as the fabulous embellishment of an ordinary occurrence, although there is not a trace of such embellishment in the laconic representation which is the oldest of all, and the additions in Mark's account assist in warding off the idea of a complete disappearance of the leprosy. Schenkel and Keim, however, following in this Paulus of Heidelberg, assume that there is here no question of a cure of leprosy, but of a pronouncing clean, although such a proceeding would be absolutely aimless unless Jesus wished to spare the convalescent the journey to Jerusalem, and it is not conceivable how such a modest benefit could ever have been developed into a cure of leprosy.

refrain from attending the temple service without giving the greatest offence. When He speaks of the hour of worshipping in spirit and in truth as being now present, He does not thereby exclude the homage paid in Jerusalem as a place of worship (John iv. 23). When going up to Jerusalem to the last Passover, His disciples ask Him where the supper is to be made ready (Mark xiv. 12). They assume, therefore, that He will observe it according to the established order, as is involved, indeed, by the slaying of the lamb in the temple. Even a saying, included in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 23 f.), assumes that His followers still present the customary offerings; for it is clear that this was not directed to the people, from the sacrificer being commanded to be reconciled with his brother.[1] Through His prohibition to lepers, moreover, Jesus fully recognised the prerogative of the priests, and even in the last days of His life He approved of the most particular fulfilment of the law of tithes, always assuming that in so doing the weightier matters of the law were not neglected (Matt. xxiii. 23). He continued to pay the temple tax, although aware that He and His were not legally bound to do so (Matt. xvii. 27), and what He said against voluntary bequests to the temple only referred to cases in which prejudice was done to the legal obligations to parents (Mark vii. 9–13).

His conduct at the healing of the leper showed at the same time that He recognised and maintained the Old Testament ordinances as to cleanness and uncleanness. This makes it the more unlikely that He should at any period have absolved His disciples from observing them. When He was reproached with allowing His disciples to eat with unwashen hands, it is

[1] The duty of making amends for the wrong done, and of soothing the sinful wrath which had been aroused in a brother, has such a high value put upon it that Jesus in the most striking way bids him interrupt the sacrifice in order to do so, showing that the moral duty ranked higher than the obligation to worship. But then the same thing is found in Hosea, who was a prophet of the old covenant (vi. 6; comp. Matt. xii. 7); and Mark assumes that the idea of love being more than all burnt-offerings, might easily occur, even to a scribe (xii. 32 f.). When Jesus says that such a one is not far from the kingdom of God (ver. 34), it corresponds perfectly with the fact that the fulfilment of the law which He desired to realize in the kingdom of God would ultimately be comprised in the imitation of God's all-comprehensive love (Matt. v. 45, 48); but neither does it alter the fact that He maintained intact the full authority of the Old Testament form of worship.

clear from the formulating of the reproof, that it did not refer to legal precepts, but to the traditions of the elders (Mark vii. 5), as was also the case when He absolved His disciples from observing the fasts of the Pharisees (Mark ii. 18). The first evangelist is right in introducing in this place one of Jesus' sayings, probably preserved by oral tradition, which clearly expresses the principle upon which He acted: "Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not shall be rooted up" (Matt. xv. 13). The law of God must be kept, but it must be His law alone; Jesus did not recognise the human statutes with which it had been enlarged by Pharisaic learning, for these not only detracted from the nature of the law, but were in some cases directly contrary to it (Mark vii. 8). When Jesus takes the Levitical regulation for cleanness as the similitude of the higher type of true, ethical purity which should obtain in the kingdom of God (Mark vii. 15), He is as far from abrogating the law as He was from abolishing a human regulation when He took a simile from it for the regulations of the divine kingdom (comp. Book iv. chap. viii.).[1] The rite of circumcision was included among those laws of purification, and yet it would be very singular to deduce a want of esteem for it from the fact of Jesus never commending it to His disciples, and never requiring it of the believing Gentiles. Indeed, all His disciples belonged to the circumcision, and as to the receiving of the Gentiles into the religious fellowship of the people to whom alone He was sent (Matt. xv. 24), Jesus never had an opportunity of expressing Himself, and the regulations admitting them to a more or less active share in the blessings pertaining to Israel had long been settled. Moreover, if Jesus had expressed Himself in any way, the entire historical attitude of the primitive Church to the question of missions to the Gentiles would have been an

[1] It may be that the first evangelist, living at a time when the circumstances were completely altered, looked for and found in Jesus' utterances bearing on the customs of cleansing, a dispensation from the Mosaic law of meats (Matt. xv. 11), but there is not the most distant reference to anything of the kind in the words of Jesus as they are contained in Mark in what is probably their original form, nor does it necessarily follow even from the expression of the first evangelist. On other occasions, too, Jesus indicated that all endeavours to attain to outward purity could only be well-pleasing to God when preceded by inward pureness (Matt. xxiii. 26).

insoluble puzzle. He only once alludes to circumcision, and then as to a pre-Mosaic institution, and He regards it quite in the Old Testament sense as the cure of a member from the impurity belonging to it by nature (John vii. 22 f.).

Jesus appears to have taken up a more independent attitude towards one point in the Mosaic law—that relating to Sabbath observance. Our tradition contains no more certain reminiscences than those referring to the disapprobation called forth by the conduct of Jesus and His disciples. The example of this given by Mark (ii. 23 f.) must have occurred when His Galilean ministry was at its height, for it assumes that the corn was already ripe; but it possesses, notwithstanding, fundamental importance for the whole question. Passing with Jesus through the corn-fields one Sabbath, the disciples plucked some of the ears to appease their hunger. This pulling of corn was expressly permitted by one of the humane regulations of the Old Testament (Deut. xxiii. 25); but the Pharisees regarded it as a desecration of the Sabbath, since it might be looked on as a species of harvest labour; and though this seems very small to us, yet they could appeal to the fact of its being forbidden to gather manna on that day (Ex. xvi. 22 f.). The answer which Jesus gave on this occasion has been preserved only in Mark, who tells the story according to Petrine tradition (ii. 27).[1] According to him, Jesus went back upon the purpose of this divine institution, and gave great prominence to the fact that the Sabbath was appointed for the sake of man, and that man was not made for the Sabbath. He asserted, too, that the Sabbath was given to man for the rest and refreshment necessary to him, and therefore that human exigencies must not be sacrificed for the Sabbath rest. He regards the institution of the Sabbath rest not as a legal enactment, through the observance of

[1] The justification contained in Mark ii. 25 f. and ii. 28 probably belongs to a series of sayings in which the oldest source collected what Jesus had said about His observance of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 2–8); for the apparent relation between the eating of the shewbread and the grains of corn does not correspond with the connection, for it was not the eating which was blamed, but the gathering of the ears; what follows agrees still less, although the first evangelist, following the leading of Mark, weaves it into his account. On the other hand, the remark with which Mark passes from the subject is equally derived from the Petrine tradition as the narrative.

which God's satisfaction can be acquired, but as an act of divine grace, the intention of which is interfered with when it is transformed into a force compelling man to refrain from satisfying his natural requirements. It is indeed evident from all this, that in what Jesus says He only reproduces the intention of the Lawgiver, in order to deduce from it the fulfilment of the Sabbath law which He Himself has in view. Even John represents Jesus as going back for justification of His observance of the Sabbath upon the Old Testament conception of the institution, according to which the Sabbath rest of earth is only the facsimile of the divine rest on the Sabbath of creation (Gen. ii. 1–3). But as certainly as God did not cease to operate on that day, but has continued to do so uninterruptedly, so certainly must there be for all true sons of God a course of action on that day perfectly compatible with sabbatical rest (John v. 17). He to whom the fulfilment of the divine will is no longer a burden but a pleasure, no longer labour and toil but refreshment (John iv. 34), finds no opposition between the repose of the Sabbath and the labour of the working day; he can observe sabbatical quiet even when engaged in the most important duties of his calling. It is possible that Jesus exemplified this view of it in His own action, for it was there it first became a living reality; but assuredly He did not explain His conduct by the unique character of His Sonship, as seems to be understood by John, for it is the task of all God's children to imitate their Father's action (Matt. v. 45).

It is evident from this, that Jesus deduced the proper fulfilment of the Sabbath law from the purpose and character of its institution; indeed, where He did not simply refer to the prevailing practice, which in spite of all its scrupulosity had been obliged to admit certain exceptions to its rule (Luke xiii. 15, xiv. 5), He always sought to prove from the Old Testament itself that His fulfilment of the law corresponded in many ways to the intention of the Lawgiver as expressed there. Thus He appeals to the occupations of the priests on Sabbath, which, according to Pharisaic ideas, must be profanation, and yet are certainly innocent since they are commanded by the law itself. But if any one should say that the priests were busy in the temple service,

which as the sacred centre of the Old Testament worship made all their work sacred, it is answered that here is One greater than the temple (Matt. xii. 5 f.). These words could only have been understood as meaning that since the perfected revelation of the promised era of salvation had appeared in Jesus, everything He did was consecrated in a still higher sense than was the service of the priest in the sanctuary of the preparative revelation. Thus John (vii. 22 f.) represents Jesus as referring to the fact that the law required the performance of the ancient and sacred ordinance of circumcision on the eighth day (Lev. xii. 3), without any consideration as to whether the day was a Sabbath or not, thereby placing His cure of a man on a much higher platform than the cure of a member by circumcision. It is clear from it all, that even the Lawgiver had action in view which was not incompatible with Sabbath repose. But besides this, Jesus saw indications in the symbolical history of the Old Testament that must have aided the comprehension of the divine will, which was to be realized in the correct fulfilment of the Sabbath law. According to 1 Sam. xxi., David and his followers undoubtedly infringed the priestly prerogative when, being an hungered, they ate of the shew-bread which the priests alone were allowed to touch (Matt. xii. 3 f.). The fact of this action not being blamed by the Old Testament, and of its occurring, not when the sanctuary was deserted, but when under the protection of the lawful high priest (ii. 26), may be taken as an assurance that the breaking through of the legal order of worship was, in cases of great necessity, not against the will of the Lawgiver. Indeed it was said by one of the prophets, that God esteemed mercy more than sacrifice (Hos. vi. 6), and therefore He must necessarily prefer works of mercy upon that day to an irksome keeping of Sabbath forms which prevent such acts (Matt. xii. 7); in one of the sayings recorded by Mark (iii. 4), Jesus makes a decisive application of this principle.

It is also absolutely incorrect to assume that Jesus released His disciples from the principle of the Sabbath law, or gave up the legal standpoint as being in opposition to His person, or that He intentionally undertook long journeys with His disciples on the Sabbath, although they were forbidden in the

law, and rather courted than avoided the disapproval this gave rise to, in order that He might gradually open the eyes of His contemporaries. As in the Sermon on the Mount, so here He rather taught how the Sabbath law was to be fulfilled according to the real intention of the Lawgiver; and as an answer to recent objections, it need scarcely be mentioned that He regarded this Lawgiver to be God Himself. It was very characteristic of Him to assume in His last speeches that His disciples would hold the observance of the Sabbath too strictly to permit them to escape on that day, and therefore He bids them pray that they should not require to flee upon a Sabbath (Matt. xxiv. 20). He Himself would certainly have risen above such solicitude, but He knew well that His followers could not easily take up His independent attitude towards this law, nor wean themselves from the anxiety about its observance, which they had inherited from their fathers; and for that He did not blame them. It really came to this in the end, that each man should fulfil the law as he was himself convinced the will of God required. On this point assuredly, as in respect to the whole law, the primitive Church fulfilled it with a punctilious strictness which gained the highest esteem of their contemporaries. Historically, however, it is quite inconceivable that, in regard to a point so important for all time, Jesus should have been completely misunderstood by His disciples, or that out of attachment to the customs of their fathers they should have despised His word.[1] Their conduct, indeed, rather shows that Jesus held the whole Old Testament law to be binding, and laid them under an obligation to fulfil it according to the meaning of the divine Lawgiver, although it was only gradually they could learn to understand this meaning with the completeness with which their Master had understood it from the beginning.

It certainly does not follow from this, that Jesus had in view the eternal duration of the Old Testament law of worship

[1] It is an unworthy supposition of Strauss, that, terrified by the fate of Jesus and that of a certain Stephen who understood Jesus better than His Galilean disciples had done, these disciples in regard to this point kept themselves on a line that was not only more protected, but more within their powers of comprehension.

in its literal form. Even the fulfilment of the whole law, as He taught it in the Sermon on the Mount, was, looked at from one side, a dissolving of the form of the national law in which the divine will was revealed. And in the same way the perfect fulfilment of this divine will, as it was revealed in the Old Testament ordinance of worship, must ultimately have broken through the form of the regulations which were given for the service of a distinct people, and for the conditions of its religious life. If the law, therefore, was to be perfected in the kingdom which Jesus was to establish, it was self-evident that the divine will expressed in it would there be realized more completely. Even when sitting beside Jacob's well, Jesus had looked forward to the time when worship should neither be offered in Jerusalem nor in Gerizim (John iv. 21), and at the cleansing of the temple He pointed to a more perfect realization in the kingdom of God of the whole temple institution (John ii. 19; Mark xiv. 58); and if the sons of God were free from the temple tribute (Matt. xvii. 26), there was no longer any need for an external temple, to the maintenance of which no one was any longer bound. But the age had still to come which was to see in the consummation of the kingdom of God the perfect realization of the divine thoughts which had been temporarily expressed in the Old Testament rules of worship; and the manner in which the consummation was to be brought about depended upon the historical development which should bring this future to pass. As yet Jesus lived and laboured in the midst of the nation for whom these ordinances, in their temporary form, had been destined; He could neither touch those ordinances, nor give injunctions for a future that would receive its concrete form by the success or non-success of His ministry, so creating the conditions for an after change. Not until the bearing of the nation to Himself and His ministry had made it necessary for the history of the world, and of redemption, that He should crown His work with the sacrifice of His life, could it be clear that if His blood, as the atoning blood of sacrifice, fitted His followers for the community of the New Covenant (Mark xiv. 24), the sin-offering of the Old Covenant was no longer necessary after its highest purpose had been fulfilled. Not until His work upon earth had been put an end to by a

violent death, could it be manifest that He who was exalted to heavenly majesty would make His dwelling with His Church, as Jehovah had once made His in the temple among His people (Matt. xviii. 20; John xiv. 23). Then, certainly, the divine institution of the temple was fulfilled in a higher sense; indeed, it was only so this could be done, for the rejection of its Messiah meant the fall of Israel, and, with the national life, there fell also the form of worship inseparably connected with it. When Jesus prophesied the destruction of the ancient sanctuary (Mark xiii. 2), He cannot have looked forward to the everlasting continuance of a form of worship so entirely connected with this sanctuary. Besides, the obduracy of Israel, which brought about this destruction, went hand in hand with the passing of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles. So soon, indeed, as this kingdom began to develop among foreign nations, the rules of life, which had been given by God for the popular life of Israel, had to give way before new ordinances. Although Jesus had little desire to abolish the Levitical laws of purification when He took them as the similitude of true ethical purity (Mark vii. 15), yet the knowledge would grow that the higher aim of the one was fulfilled in the other.

To prepare for this future was not the task of Jesus' earthly ministry. It was still seed-time. Not until the time of harvest, which Jesus reserved for other labourers (John iv. 37), would those appear who should complete the separation from the Church of the forms of the Old Testament law of worship. He did not summon any of His apostles to do this; they had been won by Him in their own land, and were destined to labour among their own people. He for whom this task was reserved, was growing up in a distant country of the Gentiles under the roof of a strict Pharisaic home.

# CHAPTER XII.

## JAIRUS' DAUGHTER.

EVEN the oldest source preserved an account of a certain ruler who appeared before Jesus and worshipped Him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her and she shall live,—a request which Jesus complied with by following the father home (Matt. ix. 18 f.). In this case, as in every other, the incident was preserved for the sake of some significant words uttered by Jesus on this occasion, and for their miraculous confirmation (ix. 24 f.), so that we learn little about the details of the story, and nothing as to the time and place where it occurred.[1] From the fact of Mark mentioning that the father's name was Jairus, and that he was one of the rulers of the synagogue,[2] it is certain that he got his knowledge of the incident, not from the account of it in the oldest source alone, but also from the communications of Peter. Another proof is his mentioning by the way that the maiden was twelve years old (Mark v. 42). Probably too he gives the real state of the case, when he represents the father as first coming

[1] The supposition that this followed directly upon the cure of the leper and the centurion's son, and therefore took place during the early part of Jesus' ministry, can only be inferred from the way in which the first evangelist fits it into his composition; and as it seems to be from topical reasons that Mark unites it with the visit to the eastern shore (v. 1–10), his arrangement does not tell in favour of a later date. Although Mark does not say so directly, yet it is not improbable, judging from his description, that the petitioner was from Capernaum, and this was evidently what the first evangelist thought.

[2] The criticism which is specially interested in expunging every trace of detail from the narrative in order that it may be pronounced mythical, has taken this name to be a fictitious one, and has sought to find in it some reference to the narrative which follows; this, however, is contradicted by the fact that not only did Mark not explain the name Jair, well known from Num. xxxii. 41, but by giving it a Greek form he made its signification quite unrecognisable.

to implore Jesus to lay His hand upon the child then lying at the point of death, so that she might be saved (v. 22 f.); and according to him, it was not until Jesus was on His way to the house that tidings of her death were received (v. 25). It is quite in correspondence with the method of the oldest source that it placed no value upon these details, but gave special prominence to the raising from the dead. But that Mark, by the use of them, desired to place the raising from the dead on a higher platform as it were, is a supposition of a most artificial character. As we never hear of the dead being brought to Jesus that He should resuscitate them, nor of Jesus being called to one already dead, there is every historical probability in the father calling Him to cure his daughter, who was lying at the point of death, and none that the parent thought for a moment of a raising from the dead.

An incident occurred while they were on their way to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, which even the oldest source thought worth preserving. A woman who for twelve years had suffered from a chronic malady, forced her way to Jesus from behind, and touched the fringes of His upper garment (Matt. ix. 20).[1] In this case also Mark has gleaned more particulars as to this woman's complaint. She had long sought help from every kind of physician, submitting herself to the most painful experiments, and sacrificing her whole fortune in the attempt to find a remedy; but for all she was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse (v. 26). It is from Mark too that the first evangelist has taken the reason for her conduct; having heard so much of Jesus' miraculous cures, she thought to obtain deliverance from her trial if she could merely touch the garment of this great miracle-worker (Matt. ix. 21, following Mark v. 28). According to the

[1] It was not shamefacedness merely that prevented her from coming to Jesus, as the other sick did, to tell of her suffering and to implore a cure; but from the fact of her being rendered unclean by her malady (comp. Lev. xv. 25-27), she did not dare to ask for the health-giving touch, for the great man could not grant her request without making himself unclean. Moreover, we learn incidentally that, in accordance with the law (Num. xv. 38 ff.), Jesus wore at the four corners of His upper garments the *tsîtsith*, *i.e.* the tassels or tufts, which were fastened there by a ribbon of blue, that the wearers might be reminded of the commands of God and so guarded from idolatry.

oldest narrative, when Jesus felt the touch He turned round and, because of the woman's faith, promised the cure which began that very hour (Matt. ix. 22). She was the subject of a divine miracle. The prayed-for cure was hers because she had with sure confidence sought help from Him whom God had sent for the healing of the nation. No attention was paid to her superstitious idea that the remedy was obtained by touching Jesus' garment; for the religious value of faith is perfectly independent of the more or less correct conceptions of divine things which are united with it. The idea of the cure being caused in any way by an act of volition on the part of Jesus, is contradicted by the representation of the oldest source. It is there assumed that so soon as Jesus beheld the woman whose touch He had felt, He understood why she had touched Him, and knew that God had healed her because of her faith.[1]

Here also Mark, following the Petrine tradition, has represented the course of events more pictorially and vividly. First of all, we hear that Jesus as usual was surrounded by the multitude which followed and thronged Him, and that, on feeling the touch, He turned and asked who had touched Him (Mark v. 24, 30). This is plainly a more accurate description, for Jesus might indeed guess that some one had in this way sought healing; but He could not possibly know at once who among that crowd had touched Him, more especially as the woman, judging from her subsequent behaviour, immediately attempted to lose herself among the crowd. It is, besides, perfectly credible that the disciples should be amazed at Jesus' question, for it might well be doubted whether, exposed as He was continually to the throng of the multitude, He was

[1] It was this representation which even Strauss regarded as being credible in its way; he looked upon it as being equally truthful and modest, as correct and precise, for Jesus to say her faith had saved her, *i.e.* in his meaning of the term, for he looked upon the power of imagination, strained as it was by expectation, and the powerful psycho-physical impression made by Jesus as having brought about either the actual extinction, or at least a momentary alleviation, of the malady. He overlooks, however, that in that case the woman was deceived by Jesus, for she plainly looked for a miraculous cure, and could only understand his remarks as meaning that such a cure had been granted her for the sake of her faith. According to what we have discussed before (vol. ii. p. 108 f.), the woman apprehended His words more correctly than the modern critic has done.

able to notice a single touch (v. 31). Jesus did not allow Himself to be misled by their objections, but looked round for the person He sought. Trembling from fear, the woman at last presented herself, and falling down before Him, confessed the whole truth. Jesus might have made the healing operation retrogressive, which had been caught from Him almost against His will, or might have punished her self-help in some other way, but He promised her that the cure should be a permanent one (v. 32–34). It is evident from this latter touch that not only did Mark enlarge the narrative from his peculiar tradition, but that he endeavoured at the same time by a reflection of his own to make the course of it clearer;[1] this is quite clear from his statement as to the way in which he thought the cure had been brought about. He too proceeds upon the supposition that it could not have been a directly divine miracle, but that it must in some way have been effected by Jesus Himself; and he found a point of contact for this idea in what was said by the disciples. If among the unavoidable touches to which He was constantly exposed in the throng of people, Jesus marked this one particularly, it cannot have been so much the external touch as the strange consequence which made Him so peculiarly susceptible. In this way the idea was suggested to Mark, that a miraculous healing power proceeded from Him at the woman's touch, and that Jesus perceived what had taken place (v. 30).[2] But for the way in which he proceeds to carry out this assumption of his there is not only no analogy in our Gospel, but the idea is there shown to be utterly inadmissible, because such an involuntary issuing of miraculous power from Jesus is contrary

[1] At least the addition in Mark v. 34 does not necessarily require any special tradition upon which to rest, for those decisive words of Jesus, on whose account principally this story was preserved in the oldest source, are certainly authentic. It is perfectly evident, if Mark understood these words so, that Jesus not only promised the woman the certainty of cure because of her faith, but that the cure should be completed which she felt had already been begun (v. 29); and therefore, because she was conscious of this already, prominence is given to the fact that this promise from Jesus gave her the assurance of a permanent cure.

[2] This reflection of the narrator's was first put in Jesus' mouth by Luke (Luke viii. 46). Weisse supposes that Mark imagined this power of healing to be a corporeal one, which by a mere touch could produce an effect similar to magnetism, but this is by no means confirmed by Mark's representation. Luke vi. 19 is manifestly taken from this narrative.

to all we can gather as to the motive for His cures and His way of effecting them. Apologetics has attempted in vain to facilitate this conception, by making it appear that Jesus permitted the virtue to proceed from Him; but that is entirely opposed to the sense of our narrative, which represents Jesus as learning afterwards what that virtue had effected, and it makes Jesus' question a palpable dissimulation, for He must have known for whom He had allowed virtue to leave Him.[1]

While Jesus and the father were still on the way, the latter received a message not to trouble the Master further, for the child was dead. We see from this how death had put an end to every hope, for no one thought of the possibility of the girl being raised to life again. But Jesus, overhearing the message, commanded the father not to fear, but only to believe (Mark v. 35 f.). Precisely because nothing of the kind had ever happened before, the father likewise might have given up hope, and without faith he would not have experienced God's miraculous aid. Jesus, however, who had had this in view in coming, knew that His heavenly Father, to whom nothing is impossible, would not deny Him this, if only the presupposition for such a divine gift were not lacking. It is therefore a purely irregular supposition on the part of modern Rationalism to represent Jesus as giving the father a well-considered diagnosis of the disease, or else as knowing in some way that the child's case was not so serious after all, and that this was nothing more than a kind of lethargic faint, which was at once the result of exhaustion and at the same time the

[1] Mark relates elsewhere, that sick people hoped to be cured by merely touching Jesus, when on account of the crowd they could not expect that Jesus could attend to each personally (iii. 10); we even learn incidentally that they besought permission to touch Him (vi. 56), and as many as did so were made whole. It was evidently upon these facts that Mark rested the supposition of the touch being the really effectual mediator of the cure. But then he did not take into account that the case was very different when Jesus aided the feeble faith of the sick by permitting them to touch Him if they did not expect to be cured without some kind of perceptible accommodation, or if they only saw in it the sure guarantee for their promised cure. In this case, however, the corporeal touch is said to *produce* the flow of a miracle-working virtue quite independently of Jesus' knowledge and volition; there is something specifically magical in such a supernatural causality being brought into activity by natural means, and this is thoroughly contrary to the way in which Jesus at other times declares and shows Himself to be the Mediator of the divine miraculous assistance.

starting-point of fresh power. Jesus in no way indicates that He regards the message as exaggerated; He does not comfort the father with the possibility of its being only an apparent death, but He makes help dependent upon the father's faith, although that would have no bearing on the result if Jesus had any reason whatever for supposing that there was still hope. The father, however, has faith; the messengers cannot induce him to cease troubling Jesus, who is brought to the very house. The company of mourners had already arrived, consisting of relations and acquaintances, along with the customary hired wailing-women; weeping and lamentations filled the house, and the first evangelist mentions the flute-players who formed part of the pomp of Jewish mourning. The oldest source simply says that when Jesus entered the house of the ruler of the synagogue, He commanded the noisy crowd to give place. There is no reason for all this wailing; for the maid is not dead, but only asleep. The people deride Him; for they know only too well what the state of the case is, and yet they obey His command (Matt. ix. 23 f.).[1] Jesus knows besides that the miracle will happen, that the state of death the maiden was in, and out of which she was immediately to be called back to life, only resembles a sleep from which one awakes after a short time. He must, however, have had a special purpose in view in expressing Himself so ambiguously. He did not wish to have the reputation of being a raiser of the dead; the people must not believe that He is come to bring their dead back to life, as He has come to heal their sick. The multitude were to regard the child, not as dead, but as sleeping. They may mock Him as they will, but the result will show Him to be right.

[1] These ambiguous words of Jesus are seized on by the rationalistic view which holds that the child was only apparently dead; it finds here "a protecting bulwark which mocks all the attempts of the most decided miracle-view, of the so-called higher standpoint of faith." Strauss termed this "a most miserable exegesis," and in respect to this naturalistic explanation he was undoubtedly right, for it never could explain how Jesus was able to arrive at this conclusion. He had not yet set foot in that chamber of death, and had never seen the child. What matters then all this pathetic talk about His not being confused by all these lamentations, how He perceived at a glance the state of the case, and courageously put an end to this groundless sorrow? Only a miracle of divine omniscience could enable Him to understand the matter better than the assemblage of mourners.

This view is thoroughly confirmed by all the details brought forward by Mark. He mentions first of all that before entering the house of mourning, Jesus left the remainder of His followers behind, taking with Him only Peter and the two sons of Zebedee (v. 37). Something quite extraordinary, then, must have been about to happen, something which all were not to know; He cannot hope to find a body that is only apparently dead, in which case indeed there would have been no reason for preventing the others from being eye-witnesses. At the same time, however, the evangelist appeals for testimony to this extraordinary event to these actual eye-witnesses, one of whom is his voucher for it. Only those whom Jesus takes with Him shall see that God grants Him power to call back the dead into life; and He enters the chamber of death with His three confidants and only the father and mother besides (v. 40).[1] In this respect, also, Mark knows how to complete the older description. There, mention is only made of the words which the crowd laughed to scorn, and of the fact that when Jesus took her hand, the child arose like one roused from sleep (Matt. ix. 25). Mark, however, has learned from one of the eye-witnesses the very words which Jesus spoke to the child on taking her hand. It is indeed a strange imputation, that Mark's repetition of these words in the Aramaic speech, which was of course employed by Jesus, is only intended to serve as a mystical embellishment of the history, especially as he adds the Greek translation for the benefit of his Grecian readers. Jesus certainly did not employ words of magic to bring the dead to life. He possesses the undoubted assurance that God's miraculous power has vouchsafed to faith the greatest of all blessings, and has called the dead back to life; for He does not turn to one who is sleeping the sleep of death and bid her awake, but He says to one already roused from death, *Talitha cumi, i.e.* Little

[1] When Mark, in the words of the oldest source, represents Jesus on entering the house of mourning as declaring that there is no reason for this sorrow and crying, and then as driving out the crowd (v. 38-40) when they laugh what He says to scorn, this is manifestly connected with the pragmatic significance which, in connection with what preceded this narrative, he gives to this ridicule of Jesus. The unbelief here manifested seems to him the real reason for Jesus expelling the crowd; the punishment for the mockers, who do not expect from Him what His words promise, is that they shall not behold the miracle.

maiden, arise. It is through Jesus that the dead is given back to life; Mark gives prominence to the fact that after rising, the child walked about quite well, and Jesus bade them give her to eat (Mark v. 41–43). That is no dietetic prescription for a convalescent, as has been supposed, upon the hypothesis of an apparent death, but a sign of her return to completely normal existence. What is of most importance, however, is the fact of the eye-witnesses, whose vividly-depicted astonishment showed that something extraordinary had happened, being forbidden to speak of the occurrence. If Jesus merely gave a correct diagnosis of the case which was confirmed by the result, this prohibition is unintelligible; indeed, it almost inevitably rouses the suspicion that Jesus, by so dissembling, wished to produce belief in His having awakened one from the dead. But if the case actually stood thus, it only confirms what we recognised as being the purpose of His ambiguous words. If the eye-witnesses were not permitted to tell how at His word the dead had been given back to life, the other people must have received the impression that the child only slept, and that Jesus had understood the case better than they.

The purpose of such a dispensation would be difficult to understand, even if there was any possibility whatever of reconciling the hypothesis of an apparent death with the presuppositions of our narrative, and with the fact that our tradition intends doubtless to tell of a raising from the dead. An attempt has been made to regard it as a miracle of divine providence, and it has been said to harmonize with the confidence in God, which Jesus encouraged in the unhappy father, that the child should not be absolutely dead, but only have sunk into a death-like faint. If under any circumstances Jesus neither could nor would awaken from the dead, such an event happening at this juncture would only put His ministry in a false light; for so surely as unconditioned trust in God's miraculous assistance was justified while Jesus was ready and able to mediate it, as surely was it a doubtful proceeding to induce such trust by the hope that the death, which had taken place according to the counsel of God, would prove to be only an apparent one; or else there is here only an exchange of one miracle of divine omniscience for another. If

the miracle must be got quit of at any price, nothing remains but to give up the historicity of the narrative. But since it lacks any preponderating motives for a legend or myth formation,[1] it has been thought necessary to assume that the supposition of His having actually raised the dead arose from statements of Jesus, as found more particularly in John (comp. Luke xv. 24, 32), which spoke of a resuscitation from death to newness of life in the spiritual sense; it has also been supposed—a supposition which Strauss finally accepted—that our narrative is a symbolic representation of this assumption. The true theme of this fiction would then lie in the words of Jesus which pronounced the death of the believer to be only a sleep, because a speedy awakening would be his at the resurrection; and in the prohibition of lamentations for the dead, which in the Christian view of death had no longer any justification. But as the oldest form of our narrative appears connected with concrete historical reminiscences by reason of the intertwining of the story of the woman with the issue of blood, so the conception of its being a free symbolic fiction is therefore precluded by its own character.

Unique as is this raising from the dead in the older tradition, it was not the only one of its kind in the course of Jesus' life. Apart from the raising of Lazarus, which bears an exact resemblance to this, in so far that in both cases the cure of the sick was first requested, and that not until death had made this impossible did God vouchsafe deliverance from the dead, Luke has preserved from his own special source

[1] The mere tendency of legend to imitate the raisings from the dead which were wrought by the prophets (1 Kings xvii. 2; 2 Kings iv.), does not explain the concrete features of our narrative; it has therefore been supposed that the reason for this imitation is, that Jesus desired by means of it to give a guarantee for His own rising from the dead. Manifestly, however, both these motives are in contradiction to legend formation. An imitation of one of the prophet's miracles could not demonstrate what the incident had not proved in the case of prophets who were not yet risen; an awakening from the dead by Jesus, which should be the prefiguration of His own resuscitation, could be no imitation of the prophet's action. But if, proceeding upon the hypothesis of myth formation, it is said that the specific calling of the Messiah to raise the dead at the Judgment day (comp. John v. 28) must in some way have been verified in His earthly life, yet a raising again to the earthly life which would close ultimately with natural death was really no security for the raising to eternal life which was expected from the Messiah.

another story of the same kind (vii. 11–15).[1] The narrative is connected with a definite locality,—the little town of Nain, lying south-east of Nazareth; and we shall see that the period when Jesus visited this neighbourhood may even yet be precisely determined. In this case also the circumstances were of a peculiar character. At the gate of the town Jesus meets a funeral procession; it is the only son of a widow, who is being borne to his grave amid expressions of universal sympathy. Touched with compassion, Jesus approaches the cortege, bids the mother dry her tears, and causes the bearers to stand still while He touches the bier. It has been said that the virtue streaming from Jesus' body may have roused the dead through the wood of the bier, but this has only been done with the view of damaging the Evangelic narratives of miracles by the most absurd conception of them possible. In this case too the miracle was performed by God, and by Him alone. But Jesus, knowing that God had empowered Him to perform this greatest of all deeds in order to soothe the mother's pain, commands him who had returned to life to rise up; the young man, sitting up, begins to speak, and the widow receives back the comfort and support of her declining years.[2] Although in regard to this incident also, Rationalism had recourse to the theory of an apparent death, and appealed

[1] He expressly placed this where his oldest source gives an account of a raising from the dead, because he desired to present the completed form of that story as given by Mark, and in his connection.

[2] The explanation of Jesus' proceeding in this case to raise the dead, although the presence of the multitude prevented Him from taking care, as in the case of Jairus' daughter, that the matter remained a secret, is simply this, that He was at that time beginning the great journey, which withdrew Him for a time from His popular ministry; and therefore He had no need to apprehend claims founded upon this miracle (comp. Book v. chap. iv.). The fact of the words by which Jesus addresses the young man (vii. 14) being manifestly formed after Mark v. 41, only proves that the account of the incident was not handed down minutely, not that the story is merely an imitation of that relating to Jairus' daughter; the fact too that the close of vii. 15 intentionally copies the close of a similar incident in the Old Testament (1 Kings xvii. 23), only shows that such occurrences in the life of Jesus were by preference related in the style of sacred history, but not that they are copied from it. The description of the impression produced by this event, which evidently belongs to the author, and therefore bears the type of the source (comp. Luke i. 68), reminds one of the narratives of the oldest source (Matt. ix. 8, xi. 11), and of Mark (i. 28); but that only shows how far it was from being devised extemporarily, and how close was its connection with documentary tradition.

to the fact that with the Jews burial took place quickly and most incautiously, it is evident that according to these presumptions, when Jesus bade the mother dry her tears, He could not know that a happy chance would prove her grief to be groundless. Without having seen the dead, He is certain of her son's resuscitation. If any doubt, however, is thrown upon the historicity of the narrative,[1] it can only be regarded as a fabulous or poetical traduction or imitation of the older narrative of raising from the dead; the way in which Strauss has attempted to make something of the kind visible in the motives of these narratives shows the impracticability of this view. It is sometimes said that their motive was to make an exact imitation of the raisings from the dead in the Old Testament; at others a poetical imitation by which it was thought to make the history more touching; now it is symbolical, showing that from the Christian standpoint death is not to be lamented over; then it is dogmatical, because it enhances the certainty of Jesus' raising the dead, and increases the miracle. But all this only betrays the critic's consciousness of the insufficiency or improbability of each separate motive, when he endeavours to explain by the conjoint action of such heterogeneous reasons a legendary form or fiction which could only betray itself to be such by the transparency of a definite motive.[2]

It is true that even many of those who are disposed to regard Jesus' cures as miracles, have sought to reduce the raisings from the dead to the level of such miracles of healing, by pronouncing the dead whom Jesus is said to

[1] It is alleged that the narrative is not confirmed by our older tradition, but there was no occasion for its being so, for even the oldest source assumes that the dead being raised had occurred several times (Matt. xi. 5); and there was less reason for this being recorded, as it was not distinguished in the same way that the story of Jairus' daughter was, by words from Jesus which were full of meaning, and besides it hardly contained a single fresh trait.

[2] In the case of the first motive, which proceeds upon Elijah and Elisha having raised the only sons of widows, it is not comprehensible why the older legend formation was not guided by it, or why the imitation did not extend to the details of the narrative, which are so dissimilar. But if, as Strauss asserts, the touching "Weep not"—the subjective turning-point of the radical thought of the first narrative (Matt. ix. 24)—forms the real point of this new form, it is very strange that Luke should anticipate it in that (viii. 52), for he also infers from

have raised to have been only apparently dead, or else to have had a spark of vitality remaining. But as Matt. xi. 5 shows that even the oldest source assumes that cases of the dead being raised occurred in Jesus' ministry, it is most improbable, however much the number of cases is limited, that on each occasion it happened by accident, or by divine providence, that the cases to which Jesus was summoned were not yet really fatal; besides this, it shows too that Jesus did not attempt to correct the necessarily false impression produced on the eye-witnesses that He had actually succeeded in raising the dead to life—a fact which rouses the serious suspicion that He did not really desire to do so. The difficulties found in this species of miracle are certainly not those presented in the strange questions with which now and again people have half-mockingly, half-earnestly fretted themselves and others. Such, for example, as to why Jesus, when once possessing the gift of raising the dead, did not employ it more usefully by giving back to human society persons who were held in high estimation, or whether those who had once passed through the death struggle looked forward to its happening a second time. The appeal to its having been of some advantage for the welfare of their souls, is of very uncertain expediency; but indeed the whole question rests upon the thoroughly false assumption that Jesus had at His disposal the gift of miracle-working, and therefore the gift of raising the dead. It was in regard to a case of this very kind He declared unambiguously that He asked the miracle from God, meaning by this that He could not bring the dead back to life as He chose, but only when God, in answer to His request, bade Him do so; but by

Jesus' willingness to help that the case was that of an only child (viii. 42). The narrative could only be regarded as symbolical, if the scene before the gate could be looked on as a picture of how the returning Messiah when before the door (Matt. xxiv. 33) will by raising the dead put an end to all mourning before He makes His public entrance into the kingdom of glory. Such a dogmatic tendency, however, is inconceivable; an age, credulous of miracles, which doubtless regarded the case of Jairus' daughter as having been a real raising from the dead, and assuredly never thought of an apparent death, needed no support to its faith by the greater certainty of one being dead who was on the way to the grave, than the case of a child still lying on her bed; it would see no enhancing of the divine miracle in the fact of there being no touch in this case, but only a spoken word.

reason of His oneness with the divine will He was always certain of His prayer being heard (John xi. 41 f.). The true difficulty rather consists in our being no longer able to form an idea of the consciousness of a man who had tasted of death, and had therefore learned to know the condition of the soul after its separation from the body,—a condition the nature of which is, in accordance with the divine decree, hidden from us. But this difficulty permits of a very simple explanation, from the fact that those who, in the counsel of God, were to be called back into life, had not yet entered upon the new form of life taken by the departed soul, the soul being as it were not yet roused from the slumber of death to the consciousness of having passed into the other world. To say that in that case the death was not real, that it only assumed another form of apparent death, is to overlook the fact of apparent death being a condition from which one rouses or can be aroused in a natural way, while a condition is treated of here which can be removed by no natural means, but only by a directly divine operation. Since we know nothing of the conditions under which the soul after the perishing of the body passes into the new form of life belonging to the intermediate state until the resurrection of the body, it would be presumption to affirm that it could not awaken in the reanimated body just as if out of a sleep of death, without there being any consciousness of the condition in which the soul enters that is really separated from the body.

Rightly viewed, the miracle of raising the dead by no means differs in character from any miracle of healing which results from a directly divine operation. But in no other miracle did the grace of God which appeared in the Messiah manifest itself so gloriously by overcoming the final consequences of sin, and thereby giving a pledge for the ultimate consummation of salvation. The temporal life so miraculously renewed is to the eye of faith the symbol and pledge of the eternal life in which all the paths of God will find their goal, and all His decrees of salvation their fulfilment.

# FOURTH BOOK.

## PERIOD OF THE FIRST CONFLICTS.

# CHAPTER I.

## THE BAPTIST'S MESSAGE.

IN the rock fortress of Machærus, on the farthest border of the Holy Land, the Baptist languished in chains. He had himself once upon a time referred to Him who should be his successor, and whom in spirit he had already seen with the fan in His hand ready to cleanse His threshing-floor (Matt. iii. 12), *i.e.* to sweep by His judgment the godless out of Israel like the chaff which is blown by the wind. When that time came, his gaoler would be removed, the doors of his prison would open, and along with the contrite in Israel he would enter into the glory of the kingdom of God. For long, anxious weeks he had waited for the moment when the hour of Israel's redemption should arrive, which would also be the hour of his own deliverance. He was not without intelligence concerning the man upon whom in the Jordan he had seen the Spirit descending, and who had been declared the Messiah by the voice of God.[1] But everything he heard of Jesus' doings was far from answering to his expectations. He probably learnt of the popular enthusiasm He met with while journeying through the country teaching and healing, and of the mighty signs of divine aid by which He was supported; but was this all he had expected from the Messiah? He heard nothing of any tokens of the approach of the great judgment, which alone could prepare the way for the coming of the kingdom. This probably led to his becoming more and more perplexed as to whether this was really the Expected One. It is not necessary to suppose that

[1] He was allowed to have intercourse with his disciples; in this respect the custom in the East seems to have been more liberal than ours is, as is shown for example in the imprisonment of Paul in Cesarea; in Matt. xxv. 36 it is assumed that visits to the prisoners were allowed. John would therefore now and again receive visits from his scholars, which would certainly not have been permitted if he was immured for political reasons (comp. vol. ii. p. 52 f.).

this was a peculiar temptation, which might possibly be explained by the express withdrawal of the Divine Spirit. The ground of his perplexity lay in the actual contradiction between Jesus' appearance and the picture which John, proceeding upon Old Testament prophecy, had formed of the Messiah's ministry. He had no doubt of the reality or truth of the divine revelation which had been made to him, but was dubious whether he had rightly understood the voice which had seemed to him to proclaim Jesus as the Messiah; this doubt only makes it evident that he had apprehended the divine revelation at Jesus' baptism not as an outwardly perceptible occurrence, the evidence of which from the nature of the case could not be shaken, but as an inward event it was possible to misapprehend. But in spite of all, he still held in believing obedience that He who should come after him would be the greater of the two; His own statement would remove all doubt. For this reason John sent his disciples to Jesus, and bade them ask, Art thou He that cometh, or look we for another?[1] (Matt. xi. 2 f.). We can understand what an impression this question must have made on Jesus; indeed, if the assurance of His Messianic calling had not been grounded in the profoundest depths of His self-consciousness, or had not been a directly God-given certainty, how it

[1] In vol. i. p. 361 we saw how vain the attempt was to infer from this message of the Baptist, contained even by the oldest source (comp. Luke vii. 19 f.), that John could not have received a revelation of Jesus' Messiahship, nor have directly declared Him to be the Messiah. It is impossible that he can have sent them to Jesus to have *their* doubts removed, for the answer is directly addressed to him, or that his question was only intended to spur Jesus on to more energetic action; John must have known how unbecoming it would be in him so to urge one whom he himself had described as the greater. An unsuccessful attempt has been made to dispute the historicity of the Johannine account of the Baptist by taking his question to be a sign, not of increasing doubt, but of commencing faith. As we know his conception of the nature and work of the Messiah from the speeches reported by the Synoptists, there was nothing in what he heard of Jesus' works that could lead him to suppose this was the Messiah. Miracles had been wrought before by the prophets, and a preacher, mighty by Divine Spirit and authority, he had himself also been, although he had only come to prepare the way for the Messiah; the fact of Jesus' preaching the near commencement of the kingdom of God, left room for the conception that He was only a somewhat more advanced preparer for it, and was in so far the greater of the two, as the true founder of the kingdom was still awaited. This question was regarded by Jesus Himself as a sign that John was, to say the least, greatly perplexed (Matt. xi. 6).

might have been shattered by this incredulity on the part of His forerunner. And if God's prophet began to misdoubt Him, what would become of the belief of the people who had only now begun to understand that Jesus was He whom they looked for, and who, sooner or later, would have to pass through the same conflict to which John was almost succumbing, but without any of his experiences from the past? The first evangelist is right in putting this narrative at the head of the section which tells of the commencement of disbelief in Jesus. The early period of fresh happy action, when He was surrounded by the yet unbroken enthusiasm of the people, was past. Now the time of conflict began, but the hardest struggle was not with His hostile opponents, but with the hopes and wishes of His disciples which could not be realized. That incredulous question from the Baptist seemed to Jesus like the signal for commencing the conflict.

Jesus directed the attention of John's disciples, and through them of their master, to what they heard on every hand about His ministry, of the truth of which they might personally convince themselves whenever they chose. Although the Messianic works of judgment and the establishing of the kingdom, which were expected of Him, had not yet been undertaken, still His ministry undoubtedly bore the marks which had been used in Old Testament prophecy to characterize the dawning of the promised era of salvation. The prophet had described in majestic symbols the restitution coming with the Messianic age, when the sores of the national life should be healed and all its burdens removed (Isa. xxxv. 5 f.); in Jesus' ministry of healing the prophecy was literally fulfilled, "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, and the deaf hear." The miracles of healing looked for from the Messiah were so far from being founded upon this passage (comp. vol. ii. p. 100), that any one accustomed to the figurative language of the Old Testament could only see in it a picture of the restitution of Israel in the sense of the popular expectation. Undoubtedly this had hitherto been the position taken up by the Baptist, for his doubts resulted from his not having seen any fulfilment of this promise in the national life of his nation on the political side; by declaring

it to be fulfilled in His miracles of healing, Jesus did not play with the letter of Scripture, but He said so because He saw in His miracles of healing the commencement of that great restitution, only it had first of all to be accomplished in the life of the individual, for that alone presented the necessary conditions (comp. vol. ii. p. 102 f.). While grasping the profoundest meaning of the passage, He pointed with a genial touch to the literal fulfilment of it He had been empowered to bring about miraculously, which might even open the eyes of the simple.[1] To this, however, He united the passage from the prophet, which was directly fulfilled in His didactic ministry when He proclaimed the glad tidings of the coming kingdom of God (Isa. lxi. 1) to the people oppressed with the national misery which for a theocratic nation was at once temporal and spiritual. And this although it had a more extensive reference than His ministry of healing, for it was an unambiguous promise that the kingdom of God was already come, in which the whole people should receive all promised spiritual and temporal blessings, and not alone the individual as in the case of His cures. The fact of the signs expected by the Baptist not having taken place as yet, was no reason for being perplexed about Him. But Jesus puts His warning against such doubt in the mildest form: Blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me (Matt. xi. 4–6).[2]

[1] For the comprehension of Jesus' answer everything depended upon recognising the reference to the passage in Isaiah, and therefore the addition of the lepers being cleansed and the dead raised, which only obscured the agreement of the other three miracles with the signs mentioned by Isaiah, was probably made by the author of the oldest source, who did not relate a single example of the other three cures, but mentioned the healing of the leper and one case of raising the dead. In Luke's account of Jesus' answer, he only gives His appeal to what John's disciples had themselves seen (vii. 22 f.), and he assumes in consequence that the messengers came upon Jesus while He was engaged in healing (v. 21).

[2] Jesus' answer has been regarded as an appeal to *His* miracles of healing as rational proofs of His Messianic dignity, and yet such miracles, which the prophets themselves had wrought, could not in themselves be proofs (comp. vol. ii. p. 99) if Jesus had not raised them to that position by His profound interpretation of that prophetic passage; nor could such an appeal have allayed the Baptist's doubts, for they were caused by his hearing of these miracles and of these only. Following the leading of Strauss, who, from the same mistaken supposition, represents the Baptist as looking for such miracles of healing as

When John's messengers left with this answer, Jesus began to speak of the Baptist to the crowds around Him (Matt. xi. 7). It had not escaped Him that they must be greatly impressed by this question which He had so distinctly described as exhibiting the beginnings of doubt. But what He first had to do, was to prevent any unfavourable inferences being drawn from this as to the character of their renowned prophet. He therefore reminds them of the time when they followed him in crowds to the desert; He asks them what it was they saw in him then. Certainly not an unstable man, fickle and wavering like a reed on the banks of the Jordan, tossed hither and thither by the wind; for it was not inconstancy which induced his scepticism, but the momentous contrast between the historical accomplishment and the form of the prophecy. And certainly not a weakling, like those who walk in kings' palaces clad in soft and luxurious raiment; for it was not an impatient desire to exchange his hard fate for the alluring pleasures of the Messianic kingdom which led to his asking the question, but an ardent longing for the salvation of his nation, which included indeed his own. They had regarded him as a prophet, and indeed, if Jesus was to explain the hazy suspicion which led to their unconditioned submission to his requirement, as more than a prophet—as that preparer of the Messianic era, of whom

according to his presuppositions Jesus had not yet effected, others have so apprehended the answer as if it referred to His spiritual wonders, *i.e.* the results of His spiritual ministry. But if the Baptist hesitated regarding Jesus' Messiahship on account of this impalpable ministry, his doubts would not have been removed by a reference to it; for from all we know of John, these spiritual miracles were not Messianic works such as he expected; and such a misinterpretation of the passage from Isaiah, which was so little in correspondence with that age, could only have been possible in regard to the blind regaining their sight and the dumb their hearing, but was absolutely debarred by the walking of the lame and the speaking of the mute. But if, notwithstanding, Jesus intended to suggest such a reference to the Baptist, he would at least have pointed first of all to His spiritual ministry, so that these spiritual operations should appear as their result, and He would not have described it as an announcement of glad tidings, but as a spiritual explanation or moral exhortation. But the closing words of Jesus' answer completely exclude the possibility of seeing a dawning belief in the question of the Baptist; for the fact of doubts arising does not always presuppose, as in this instance, an earlier faith, but always some connection with what is proving a hindrance to belief (comp. Matt. xv. 12, xvii. 27; Mark vi. 3); these words also show unmistakeably that Jesus' intention was to remove John's misgiving.

Malachi (iii. 1) had foretold (Matt. xi. 7–10). This prophetical statement, with which Mark, following Jesus' example, introduced what he had to say about the Baptist (Mark i. 2), was fulfilled in John, and on this account therefore he was more than a prophet. For while the other prophets had only pointed to the coming salvation, the fulfilment of the prophecy began in him. This was what made him the greatest among those who are born of woman,—the greatest figure of the Old Covenant. If the Old Covenant prepared the way for salvation, he who appeared at its close, pointing to the salvation era by preparing the way for it, must himself, according to his historical position and significance, have stood at the summit of the Old Dispensation. But as far as the period of consummation, which dawns with the kingdom of God, exceeds the period of preparation, does the exaltation of every subject of the kingdom, even if he occupies there a far lower position than John had among those born of women, exceed the greatest figure of the Old Covenant (Matt. xi. 11).

We hear from Jesus now for the first time, that—since the accomplishment commences with Him—some are already in the kingdom of God, and have therefore gained a position superior to the generations of the past. Those are His own followers who have found in Him the looked-for One, and who through faith see the kingdom of God coming in and by Him. Jesus does not desire to depose the Baptist, whom He has just protected from a reproach against his character, neither will He blame him for his spiritual non-receptivity, nor even for his attachment to the old hereditary forms of piety, to which here no allusion is made; He only wishes to prove that any one who still doubts, and asks whether Jesus be the promised One, as John has done, cannot have entered into the kingdom of God. But this does not mean that even John might not become a member of the kingdom when he conquered his incredulity; Jesus only wishes to explain how the man whose great importance He had Himself pointed out, could still be fettered by the doubts he had shown by his message. This is therefore an epoch of world-wide importance. The ages divide themselves sharply from one another, and he who was greatest in the past does not on that account belong to the present.

This brings us again to the question, what the people during such addresses must have thought of Jesus and His calling. If John was a messenger from God, sent to prepare the way of the coming Jehovah; if some were already in the kingdom of God, involving as that did of course the present existence of the kingdom, then the founder of the kingdom—the Messiah—must necessarily have appeared already, and must be He to whom John had pointed as being He who should come after him. These crowds had just heard the Baptist's message, and the question as to Jesus' Messiahship was there clearly and unmistakeably put. Jesus' answer was as equally suited to them as to the Baptist; did it not suffice to tell them that He was to be the expected One? It is really incomprehensible how it can be supposed, in spite of all this, that the people only regarded Jesus as the Messiah when He was on His last pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Is it not the opposite of this which Jesus says? Not only does He desire John's historical position and significance to be recognised, but also the importance of his ministry for the kingdom of God, although not belonging to it himself. Since the days of the Baptist—which now, owing to his imprisonment, belong to the past—down to the present moment, the kingdom of God suffereth violence, and the men of violence take it by force (Matt. xi. 12). By means of his preaching, therefore, John had called forth a powerful Messianic movement and agitation which still lasted. But how was this? Would this movement not be wasted and disappear whenever John fell powerless into the hands of his enemies, if there was no one to succeed him in bringing about, as he had promised, the Messianic period of the kingdom of God? Here was one who preached the kingdom of God, and should they not look upon him as the promised Messiah? Do they really desire to lay siege to the kingdom of God, as it were, and to take it, as it seems can only be done, by force? Do they think that the kingdom would immediately appear in its glorious consummation, as the prophets depicted, and as the people in their wildest dreams had conceived; do they really imagine they can force on the kingdom without having Him as its head, whom God has chosen to be Messiah? Jesus certainly does not praise this unseemly haste—this uproar and violence. It was

indeed these very assumptions as to the nature and appearing of the kingdom of God which made the Baptist in his dungeon doubtful of Jesus, and aroused in the people this impatient desire. This was not a mere foolish error; it was the historical conditions of His appearance which gave rise to these suppositions of the Baptist; it was the historical limits of his ministry which impressed upon the Messianic movement he had set agoing the marks of the "Sturm und Drang" period. This is why Jesus explains it so gently, almost indeed excusingly. He apprehended the law as a great prophecy of the promised epoch, which all the prophets had foretold, and of which John himself had after a long silence proclaimed the direct approach. Must the fulfilment not be expected and striven after with a certain impatience? The last prophet, he, and he alone, is the Elijah which is to come (Matt. xi. 13 f.). Just as Jesus, conformably to Malachi, had declared him at first to be the messenger of God who prepared the way for the coming Jehovah, so now He describes him as the Elijah whose coming, according to the same prophet, is to precede the day of Jehovah (Mal. iii. 23). He is therefore not a mere prophet, but at the same time is he with whom commences the accomplishment of all prophecy. How wonderful that this fulfilment is at last to seem consummated!

But Jesus was Himself dubious whether the people were prepared to regard the Baptist as the Elias of Malachi's prophecy: "If ye are willing to receive it" is what He says. For John could certainly be regarded as the preparer of the Messianic epoch, without its being acknowledged that he was the Elias there foretold. Indeed, this recognition assumes that the real task of this Elias was the durable conversion of the people (comp. Mal. iii. 24), and that without this the promised consummation could not come to pass. But that was just what the nation would know nothing of, when it demanded with such vehemence the realization of the kingdom of God. Otherwise they would have seen that this impalpable religio-ethical ministry of Jesus, which was so far from answering to their expectations, was intended to effect a real preparation of the people, towards which John had accomplished so little, but which was the indispensable condition of the longed-for consummation of salvation. This was why

Jesus addressed to them that earnest exhortation which indirectly said that the disinclination to acknowledge the Baptist as the true Elias who should prepare the people for this consummation could only produce such sensuous impatience. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt. xi. 15). But could it possibly be that the Baptist had finished his task, and that the nation was prepared for that salvation era? Jesus answered this question, which in this connection touched Him closely, with the parable of the two sons whom their father commanded to work in his vineyard: one of them promised to do so, but went not; while the other at first refused, but afterwards complied. Jesus caused the auditors themselves to draw the lesson which the parable was intended to teach—that the truly obedient is not he who promises, but he who renders obedience, however refractory his conduct at first—and then gave His explanation. The publicans and harlots, who had long refused obedience to God, had yielded the point when God required them willingly to accept the baptism of repentance for the remission of their sins; but the scribes and Pharisees, who continually played the part of zealots for the divine will, had, in that decisive moment when the fulfilment was in question, despised the counsel of God, believing that they had no need of the baptism of repentance (Matt. xxi. 28–32; comp. Luke vii. 29 f.).[1]

We see here, then, how Jesus looks back upon the experiences of that earlier Galilean ministry which had now closed. Why had these publicans and sinners sought Him out and become His followers? Precisely because they had been led by John to acknowledge their sins, and to desire

[1] Luke, who in vii. 24–28 has preserved this popular address almost word for word, stops suddenly with Matt. xi. 11, although it is shown distinctly in xvi. 16 that he was acquainted with xi. 12 f., for he thinks himself able to explain these words better in that connection. On the other hand, *vii.* 29 f. must of necessity belong to this speech, and the evangelist only removed them from this place because he wished to bring together in chap. xii. all that referred to the opposition of the Pharisees. According to Matt. xxi. 31 f., however, these words formed the application of the parable of the two sons, which the first evangelist interwove into a polemic against the hierarchy, but which, as is shown by Luke's somewhat more accurate apprehension of the words, distinctly referred to the contrast between the publicans and sinners on the one hand, and the scribes and Pharisees on the other, whose appearance characterized the experiences of Jesus' earlier Galilean ministry.

conversion. Why had the scribes and Pharisees kept themselves so distant? why had they always and only criticised and found fault with His actions? Why? because they had refused to yield the repentance demanded by God's prophet from the whole nation. This was the first time that Jesus expressed to the people a direct condemnation of this popular party, and of those who, till now, had been their leaders. His condemnation only referred to their conduct to His forerunner; but He would not have uttered it if He had not known that His own time of conflict was come, that neither party could forget the Sermon on the Mount. Between them lay the great mass of the people who had neither despised John's baptism like the one, nor repented earnestly like the other. Which party should succeed in gaining them,—this was the critical question.

But Jesus had already given expression to a condemnation of the multitudes. They desired the kingdom of God, but not as He desired it; they wished to force on its realization violently: that His whole religio-ethical ministry was for the purpose of laying the necessary foundation, they would not understand or acknowledge to be needful. Whereunto should He liken this generation? Did they not resemble bad-tempered, obstinate children, at play with their companions in the market-place. Now wishing one thing, now another; at one time playing at marriages, at another at funerals; always demanding that the other children shall play as they wish, and yet withal never contented. John appeared as a strict ascetic, that they termed wild fanaticism. After him came the Son of man, whose unique calling apparently justified a peculiar manner of life; He ate and drank, however, like other sons of men. They again regarded Him as too lax in His conduct (Matt. xi. 16–19). They were discontented with everything. This ill-humoured obstinacy was the real reason of their vehement urging for the consummation of the kingdom of God as they meant it. But they had certainly not originated the idea that the asceticism of John, of whom it was said that he neither ate nor drank, could be referred to demoniac suggestions, or even to demoniac possession. This sarcasm had certainly been suggested by the Pharisees, who even then were opposed to the Baptist (comp. vol. i. p. 316); and when

the people called Jesus a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners, they were probably repeating what had been said by His opponents. It was the Pharisees who explained His independent position in regard to the fasting observances by His liking for the pleasures of the table, and His intercourse with publicans and sinners by His predilection for more dissolute society. This was their response to what Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, touching them to the quick, although they were not once mentioned by name; Jesus knew now that the conflict was unavoidable. But what could be hoped of a people who to-day cheered enthusiastically, and to-morrow, because their hopes were still unfulfilled, repeated these malicious words of the Pharisees? Certainly, however true they were, the people did not mean them in such a bad sense. But what could He expect of such capricious children, vexed whenever the course of things was not to their mind; how could they be reconciled to a development of the kingdom of God which was contrary to all their expectations, and had proved a stumbling-block even to God's prophet? And yet there were also children of wisdom who permitted themselves to be influenced and instructed by the divine wisdom. These were not the scribes, so proud of their own wisdom, but the publicans and sinners, who now began to associate with Him more closely as His genuine adherents. Divine wisdom was justified in them, *i.e.* in all their ways and regulations, and was recognised as choosing correctly (Matt. xi. 19). It was upon them that Jesus placed His hopes; they would ultimately, although not till after severe conflicts, learn to understand the methods He pursued in accordance with the counsel of divine wisdom.[1]

We do not know what impression was produced on the imprisoned prophet by Jesus' answer. From the confidence with which he asked from Jesus the solution of his difficulty, we are justified in assuming that Jesus' message did much to raise his hopes. Still, however, he never saw the establish-

[1] The correct reading in our text of Matthew is, as Luke shows (vii. 31–35), an alteration of the evangelist's own; through the omission of the verses relating to the Pharisees and publicans, he had lost the correct relation between them and the children of wisdom, and therefore interpreted the words as meaning that divine wisdom was ultimately attested by the success of its methods and operations.

ment of the Messianic kingdom as he had it in view. It need therefore not surprise us that in the further development of Jesus' cause his disciples did not see their expectations fulfilled, and that they kept themselves distinct from the company of Jesus' followers. Doubts as to whether He was the expected One were in their case long in being stilled; but one day they too would believe. We have no right, however, to infer the Baptist's standpoint from theirs.

The Baptist's days were numbered. Herodias had never forgotten that he had blamed her marriage so severely; she dreaded that he might cause her husband's heart to be estranged from her, or might even induce him to dissolve his unlawful union; her hatred, like her fear, could only be quieted by his death. She was not without ground for this, for Herod had considerable respect for John, and heard him gladly. The more intimate he became with the inconvenient censor of morals in his dungeon, whom he had perhaps imprisoned more from outward considerations than from anger at his open censure, the closer became the relation between them. And even though frequently made uneasy by John's words, which caused him to reflect over many of his actions, he could not refrain from talking with him. He dreaded this righteous man of God, and yet felt himself constantly attracted to him; John's being kept under guard was equally a protection against the murderous schemes of Herodias, as it was a punishment for his bold rebuke. And besides, it was a very different thing to listen to him privately and to permit him to speak publicly (Mark vi. 19 f.).[1] This was the reason why some time elapsed before this offender of sovereignty was sentenced to death, and why the catastrophe was only brought about at last through an intrigue of

[1] There may have been much that was exaggerated about the reports rife in Galilee, of the evidences of favour which his ruler, who was also to be his executioner, bestowed upon this honoured prophet, even in his last days; but certainly what Mark relates in this regard corresponds with the supine character of this prince, who was not at all a bloodthirsty tyrant, and notwithstanding his frivolity and love of pleasure, was capable of higher impulses, or at least had a fear of God's punishment when he laid hands upon His ambassador. Then, too, this explains the facts lying before us better than the first evangelist's referring it to his fear of the people who counted John as a prophet (Matt. xiv. 5).

Herodias, that wife whose influence over this weak prince was once more in after days so fatal that it cost him his throne.

The prince's birthday was celebrated by a great feast. The civil and military officers of high standing, as well as many notabilities from the province, were all assembled. It was on this occasion that Herodias so contrived that Salome, her daughter by her first marriage, executed a dance before the assembled guests, which was received with tumultuous applause. The prince, excited perhaps by the pleasures of the table, was moved to give the incautious promise that he would grant her in return any request she liked to make; and when the girl seemed to hesitate, he confirmed it with an oath, even if it were to cost him the half of his kingdom. For this moment the mother had waited, and at her instigation the dancer demanded the head of John the Baptist. The rash tetrarch had never dreamed of this; he was horrified when he saw himself entangled in the toils of his promise. For although he could yet set aside his oath, he dared not compromise himself as faithless to his word before this august assemblage. What had to happen then, must at least take place quickly, so as to prevent his having any further qualms over this melancholy matter. He gave the order for execution to a soldier of his bodyguard, and the head of the Baptist fell. His disciples had the melancholy satisfaction of begging for his body and burying it (Mark vi. 21–29).

A certain criticism mangles this narrative with the most worthless objections,[1] but after it has lost all genuine

[1] Thus Strauss considered the distance between the palace in Tiberias and the mountain fortress in the south-east, where John was imprisoned, too great for the head of the man who was executed, to be brought to the capital on the same day as the feast. This bringing of the head upon a charger, was no more than a guarantee of the execution having taken place; and it was not indispensable to the conclusion of the narrative whether it was brought to the palace then or afterwards. But since there was also a palace at Machærus, the feast may very probably have taken place there, in which case the difficulty of accepting the narrative verbally is removed. But when the entire narrative is regarded as an imitation of the Esther legend (comp. Esther v. 3, 6) because of this wild promise of a prince who did not even possess a kingdom, it is self-evident the words of the prince are not verbally recorded; and usually, too, these narrators, when depicting such details, connected them readily with well-known incidents out of sacred history. Criticism at one time found the narrative too dramatic and effective; at another, there were great complaints at the bloodthirstiness of

historical motives for the dramatic development of Jesus' life, by reason of its rejection of John's Gospel, it is still interested in making out of the Baptist's execution "a well-considered action of Church and State against the perils of the situation, which cut in two ways," and which the scribes and Pharisees would fain have brought to bear upon the Baptist's dangerous successor. Nothing of all this is known in our Gospels; there was not the shadow of a reason for the Pharisees feeling a bloodthirsty enmity against the Baptist, and the prince of the country was as yet almost ignorant of Jesus (comp. Mark vi. 14). The guilt of blood which lay on Herod's soul was Jesus' best protection. The man whose conscience was already sufficiently weighted by the murder of one prophet, took great care not to connect himself with another when he received tidings about Him.

Herodias, and the incomprehensible silence of the Jewish notables. But it was only as a consequence of his arbitrary bringing down of the chronology by six years (comp. note, vol. ii. p. 53) that Keim was able to compute that at that time Salome was no longer a girl, but had long been married, and was then a reigning princess, or indeed was already a widow.

# CHAPTER II.

## THE MYSTERY OF THE KINGDOM.

ONCE more did Jesus wander along the margin of the lake, and the people as of old gathered in crowds around Him. Entering into a boat, He caused it to be pushed a little from the shore, and then sitting down, He taught the multitude who were collected on the strand. It was on this occasion that Jesus seems to have given that address, which was so distinctly borne in mind from the fact that it consisted of a series of parables (Mark iv. 1 f.). These bore directly upon the same subject which Jesus had treated of in the popular speech which followed upon the Baptist's message.[1] When He spoke then of the vehement efforts made by the people towards the consummation of the kingdom of God as having been produced by their mistaken conceptions of its nature and establishment, it might easily suggest itself to Him that He should give some explanation as to the true nature of the kingdom of God, and the real manner of its establishment. Certainly, He neither could nor would have anything at present to do with theoretic discussions; for these, the necessary intelligence was still lacking, and any hasty rupture with

[1] Although he has only preserved the first parable (Luke viii. 4–8), Luke shows that in the oldest source this address followed immediately after the Baptist's message, for vii. 36–50 is only a note inserted by the evangelist bearing upon vii. 34; in imitation of Mark, the first evangelist has arranged it according to topical points of view, adding the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, which hardly correspond to the idea of this speech, since they contain nothing opposed to the expectation of the people, and are preserved in Luke xiii. 18–21, in what is plainly their most original form, and in the connection in which they stood in the oldest source. In place of the original series of parables, in which the first one is followed by two sets of two, Mark puts a parable trilogy, for he paid no regard to their originally polemic connection, but only desired to give three pictures of the founding, development, and consummation of the kingdom of God, borrowing for the last picture from the totally different pair in the oldest source—the parable of the mustard seed; in regard to this arrangement, the first evangelist was undoubtedly influenced by Mark.

popular expectations would only have made it impossible for Him to influence the people further. He therefore seized upon His favourite form of parabolic narrative, which on this occasion, as we shall hear, was particularly suitable for His purpose.

The first parable was in the form of a story; and yet it does not narrate an occurrence which had at one time taken place under certain definite conditions, but something which happens whenever a sower goes forth to sow. For the most careful sower cannot prevent some seeds falling upon the wayside when he passes along the edge of the field; and even in comparatively good fields, spots will often be met with where the rocky ground of Palestine comes through the thin layer of soil, or where seeds of thorns lie buried in the earth. The one thing that makes the case unique is the fact of both happening to the same sower, and in a field which elsewhere is so extraordinarily fruitful that it yields a hundredfold. It is self-evident that the seed which falls by the wayside can never come to anything, for it will be devoured by the birds; what falls upon the rock shoots up, it is true, but withers away quickly, for in that thin layer of earth it cannot find the moisture which is the condition of all growth; and that which falls among thorns, will be choked by the thorns which grow up along with it (Luke viii. 4–8).[1] Corresponding with the nature of the parable, this varied result of a sower's labour is not accidental, occurring only in this one case, but is necessary in the nature of things, being conditioned by the different character of the ground upon which the seed falls;

[1] To the original form of the parable Luke adds one touch only, viz., that the seed which fell by the wayside was not only devoured, but was trodden under foot (Luke viii. 5); but Mark, who is copied almost word for word by the first evangelist, gives a more exact description of how, although sprouting rapidly in the thin, and therefore quickly heated stratum of earth lying above the rock, yet as soon as the sun rose it was scorched and withered away, because its roots could get no firm hold in the scanty soil, enabling it to draw fresh power from the ground. He also relates particularly how the seed which fell among thorns made further progress in its development, although it never bore fruit, and concludes by showing how the seed upon the good ground did not exhibit everywhere the same maximum of fruitfulness, for some bore thirtyfold, and others sixtyfold. He certainly failed to perceive that when a single case was exhibited in a parable, there could only be mention of one degree of fruitfulness (Matt. iv. 3-8; comp. Matt. xiii. 3-8).

and indeed that is what the parable is intended to exhibit as a fundamental principle, which is repeated in the higher sphere of the divine kingdom. For as the result of the sower's labour is dependent on the condition of the ground, and since, therefore, only a portion of the seed he sows actually bears fruit, the success of Jesus in establishing the kingdom is dependent upon the bearing of the people among whom He labours, conditioned as that is by the disposition of their hearts; therefore it is only partially a success. It was the mystery of the kingdom of God which Jesus desired to exhibit in this parable (Mark iv. 11), namely, that the establishment of this realm should not, as the people expected, result from a manifestation of divine power, influencing miraculously the outward life of the nation, and attended by unvarying success, but through the methods of a spiritual ministry which, like the work of the sower, encountered many hindrances, and was therefore in many respects unsuccessful. This parable therefore treats of the fundamental opposition between Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God, which He had come to found, and the popular expectations. It was not to be realized by a direct exercise of power on the part of God in the nation's destiny, but was to be rendered possible through an inward regeneration of the people. This was why Jesus concluded the parable with the same word of warning, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt. xiii. 9).

While proclaiming in this parable one of the fundamental laws of the kingdom of God, Jesus at the same time estimated the result of His ministry up to that date; for although He was everywhere met by general enthusiasm, in the case of many it lacked to His far-seeing eye genuine success. He has certainly not invented the difficulties standing in the way of the seed bringing forth fruit, which would have made the parable an allegory, and have destroyed its didactic evidence, but He has chosen what occasionally occurs in nature as most vividly portraying those who are actually opposed to His ministry, and as explaining its varied want of success. For His ministry must be absolutely without result where He is met by complete stupidity; as regards frivolity, He might perhaps gain a transitory success, but the good impressions would disappear rapidly; and in the case of the

worldliness not yet extirpated from divided hearts, it would ultimately be thwarted. The final intention of the parable, however, was not the allegorical representation of these three conditions of heart, for they contained no mystery of the kingdom of God, but it was the clear exposition of the fundamental law that the establishment of the kingdom could only result from a purely spiritual ministry, such as it must necessarily be by reason of its success being dependent upon this condition of heart.[1]

We must not fancy that Jesus uttered these parables at one time. Most probably there was a pause at the close of the first one, after which Jesus began again and related two more. These were genuine narratives, treating of certain definite circumstances. A man had accidentally discovered a hidden treasure in a field, belonging to another. Quickly hiding the treasure again, so that the owner might not hear of it, he bought the field as soon as he could turn his possessions into gold, in order to appropriate the treasure hidden there. Nothing is said in this about the legal ques-

[1] Mark, with his usual acuteness, placed the parable speech where he desired to represent the division in the nation between the non-receptive, in regard to whom Jesus' ministry was absolutely without result, and the susceptible, who only formed a remnant among the people; and for the same reason he has exclusively in view, in the interpretation of this parable (iv. 13–20, comp. p. 215), the different conditions of heart to which, in many cases, Jesus' want of success was owing. But how far the parable is from being founded upon this allegorizing interpretation, is apparent from the seed being at one time the word which Jesus proclaimed,—which was indeed the principal, but not the only means, He employed in His work of establishing the kingdom,—at another, a human soul which has been fructified thereby. The seeds of weeds *existing* in the field—although this is far too particularly emphasized—are compared to worldly cares and pleasures which *enter* into the heart, and the devouring of the seed by the birds is interpreted to mean Satan's seizing upon the word, although the parable will refer even that non-success to different conditions of heart. Even Mark's pictorial incidents (comp. above) receive an allegorizing interpretation. Thus he explains the rapid shooting of the seed in the scanty soil to mean, that the light-minded receive the word at once with joy; and the heat of the sun is, according to a common Old Testament figure, interpreted to mean sorrow and persecution; for that, in Mark's time, was the cause of many being faithless; while, according to the intention of the parable, it is plainly far more varied influences which blot out the impression made in the case of sanguine men. And as is usual in his explanations, the figure itself ceases, so here the reference to the different grades of fruitfulness which have so little in common with the fundamental thought of the parable, receives no particular explanation, but concludes with the words of the parabolic figure.

tion, whether the buyer could do so without deceiving the seller; Jesus gives no instruction as to how people should behave in similar circumstances, but He shows by an example taken from common life, where there is always some mean dealing, how no one hesitates to sacrifice his all if he can thereby gain more. This is equally the case in regard to the second example. A merchant who dealt in pearls discovered in the hands of the fishers a remarkably valuable one, through the sale of which he would gain largely. A high price was asked for it, necessitating him to sell all he possessed before he could make it up. But he paid it willingly; the pearl was worth it all (Matt. xiii. 44–46). The two parables have plainly one thought in common, and that is that the kingdom of God must, as the highest good, be sought after even to the sacrifice of everything else, just as in these two narratives every one gave up his whole possession in order to win what was still more valuable. But in the case of parable pairs, the one fundamental idea is always regarded from different sides. In the first parable the treasure is discovered unexpectedly, in the other after long search; in the one case the man appropriates it by buying the field, in the other he purchases the pearl directly. Whoever hears unexpectedly in Jesus' announcement the glad tidings of the approach of the kingdom of God, must make up his mind to follow Jesus, cost what it may, in order that he may obtain a share in the same; and he who after long search and longing for the kingdom of God becomes one of Jesus' disciples because He has promised to bring the kingdom, must perform the duties of discipleship even if they call for the most difficult sacrifices. It may be that when interpreting more particularly the various shades in Jesus' representation of the fundamental idea, the original point of comparison is transcended; but this thought is indubitably clear, and even it is distinctly opposed to the general expectation of the people. For in the promised kingdom of God the nation looked forward to a salvation which was to come without any assistance on their part, and which through an act of divine power would fall into the lap like unexpected prosperity. But in exact connection with the teaching of the first parable, Jesus shows that, as the kingdom of God must be established through a spiritual

ministry, no one could have a share in it without entering into this ministry, and being prepared to sacrifice everything that hindered its success. It was only to put the mystery of the kingdom in another way, to say that the individual would have as little share in it without sacrifice as without receptivity.[1]

Yet another pair of parables did Jesus recount in His address; it is true they are not given in narrative form, and yet they present occurrences which have not taken place *once* under distinct conditions, but occur always and everywhere in the given circumstances. A great draw-net is thrown into the sea, and gathers of every species of fish; but the greater their number and the more they differ in kind, the more probable will it be that some will be dead and even putrid. But not until the net is full and the fishing finished do the fishermen draw it on the beach, and, sitting down, gather the good fish into vessels, but send the bad away (Matt. xiii. 47 f.). This is what happens also in the establishing of the kingdom of God. Even in the call addressed to Simon (Mark i. 17), Jesus compared the winning of individuals for the kingdom of God with the catching of fish, and He borrows in this case the material for His parable from the same operation. This kind of levying secures true subjects for the kingdom of God, but also bad ones, who either do not bring the sacrifice it costs to become one of Jesus' disciples, or else do not present it properly. No question is asked, however, as to the disposition of the individual; any one is welcome who desires to become a member of the kingdom of God. But when once the great work of establishing the kingdom is completed, when the consummation of the kingdom has taken place, a separation shall take place between the good and the bad. In what, then, did this differ from the mystery of the kingdom, which Jesus had already revealed to Nicodemus (John iii. 17)?

[1] It is evident that in the oldest source this parable followed that of the good and bad ground, for it is clearly owing to Mark's influence that the first evangelist inserts in the second passage the parable of the tares, whose material was likewise taken from the corn-field, and adds afterwards the parables of the mustard seed and leaven (Matt. xiii. 24–33). But after inserting chapter xiii. 34–43, which was likewise suggested by Mark, the first evangelist passes with the same word of warning which formed the close of the first parable (xiii. 9) to these two (xiii. 43).

The nation expected that the separation of all those who were unworthy of the fellowship of the kingdom would be the first task undertaken by the coming Messiah, and that afterwards He would proceed to erect the kingdom with those who were found true; this, and nothing else, was what the Baptist had anticipated. But if the kingdom was not to be founded through an outward act of divine power of sure effect, but only through a spiritual ministry, whose success depended upon the receptivity of men, and therefore could only be obtained through gradual development, it is self-evident that it would not do to begin with a division between the worthy and unworthy, that much labour must be bestowed in preparing all for the consummation of salvation, and that the Messianic judgment must necessarily be delayed until the development of the kingdom of God was completed.

These important thoughts Jesus presented in yet another parable, by which He returned to the figure of the first. In its original form it treated doubtless of a natural circumstance of constant occurrence, namely, the growing up of tares in a field sown with good wheat; as the two resemble each other closely when in blade, the tares are only discoverable when the wheat ears begin to show. In order that the point of the narrative may be clearly seen, it is said that the servants of the farmer come and ask if they shall pluck up the weeds. But he forbids them to do so, in case they were to root up the good wheat also; and points them to the harvest, when the two shall be divided, and the tares can then be burned (Matt. xiii. 24–30).[1] This conversation with the servants

[1] Such an isolated case as a field being sown with weeds by a wicked man is contrary to the figure of the parable, which is borrowed from ordinary natural circumstances, and must therefore be an incident added by the evangelist on account of the allegorical meaning. It is shown to be such, because even in this case the servants could really never think of asking how the weeds had come there, and the master could not assume that they had been purposely sown, for the appearance of weeds in the field needed no special explanation. But the addition of such an incident made the original parable into an allegorical narrative of a perfectly singular occurrence, and yet it could not occur to Mark to give it the form of his parable of the growing seed (Mark iv. 26–29), which is taken directly from nature. He has, however, only omitted the incident of the tares, and has kept to what is, for the fundamental thought, the essential side of the parable; he brings into prominence the gradual development of the seed

places it beyond a doubt that the fundamental thought in this case, as well as in the kingdom of God, is that as there are wheat and tares in the field, so the good and bad are now gathered together in the kingdom and cannot be separated, for the division can only take place when the kingdom is consummated. But as in the previous parable unworthy members enter the kingdom at the very first, so here, too, the bad creep in, *i.e.* it may happen that some who were true subjects of the kingdom become bad during its course of development, because they are not prepared to go on presenting the sacrifice which it costs to follow Jesus. This, therefore, discloses the reason for the separation not following immediately upon admission into the kingdom of God, or while its course of development is going on,—because it is possible that those who at the beginning were unworthy might become true subjects. But another reason is hinted at in that dialogue with the servants. In the course of earthly development this separation could only be performed by men who would often not be able to distinguish certainly between the good and bad, and therefore this act had been reserved by the searcher of hearts to be performed at the last judgment.

The mystery of the kingdom was now disclosed on all sides. It does not come by means of an outward exercise of divine power, to be followed by certain effect, but by means of a spiritual ministry whose success is dependent upon the receptivity of the people; it is the highest good, but without some exertion it does not fall into the lap,—it must be acquired by the difficult sacrifice required by acquiescence in Jesus' preaching; at its foundation, as well as in the course of its development, true and false subjects will be found in it side by side, for the Messianic judgment is delayed until the final consummation. The internal connection and the unified central point of these thoughts, as well as their common

from the time of sowing until harvest, in order to present, alongside the parable of the founding of the kingdom, a picture of its gradual increase, which, through the inherent productive power of the scattered seed, ripens for the final consummation. It may be that Mark iv. 28 preserves even yet the original touch,—that the earth brings forth the tares of itself. But in any case, the common assumption that Mark presents us with an independent parable is quite untenable, for the more particularly it is analysed it is seen to consist of the elements of the parable of the tares.

antithetical reference to the popular expectation of the kingdom of God, guarantees that really this was the original series of parables in which Jesus exhibited His ideas as to the character and development of the kingdom of God. But was it possible that the multitudes understood these parables and their interpretation? It is indeed an established assumption that they were intended to represent truths, and as a result to illumine the understanding, and were a final attempt to make spiritual truths comprehensible by a sensuously inclined people. But a truth which is not yet understood cannot make any figure of it comprehensible, for it is necessary to apprehend the truth in some measure before the figure can be correctly interpreted, and before the relations can be discovered between it and the truth represented. To understand the true meaning of parables like these, one needs to understand the character of the kingdom of God so that the true application may be made of the fundamental ideas of the parable to the ordinances of the kingdom, which are analogous. The people, however, lacked any such comprehension; and Jesus cannot possibly have expected that they would acquire it through these narratives.[1]

It is true that even Jesus' most intimate adherents did not understand the parable-speech, for Mark tells how, when the crowd dispersed, His disciples asked Him what the parables should mean (iv. 10). Jesus by no means blamed their want of comprehension; the manner in which He tells the questioners, that to them, in opposition to the great multitude, was given to know of the mystery of the kingdom, and that what was concealed from it would be made known to them (iv. 11), shows incontrovertibly how it was owing to their question that they were given a preference over the crowd; it was in this that Jesus saw a sign of receptivity which would make them capable

[1] A representation which strengthens the impression made by a spiritual truth is afforded by allegory; that induces the interpretation of each separate incident, so causing the truth which it represents to penetrate deeper. This is why the allegorizing interpretation has gathered even from these parabolic speeches new and edifying references to spiritual truths with which the readers were acquainted; but even methodical exposition finds it by no means easy to discover their real fundamental ideas—that mystery of the kingdom of God which, according to His own statements, Jesus desired to exhibit in them.

of being instructed in the meaning of the parables, and therefore of penetrating into the mystery of the kingdom. This is why Mark shows so particularly that it was by no means only the disciples in the stricter sense who came and asked, but the whole of Jesus' more intimate adherents (iv. 10), who, perceiving that in Him the kingdom of God was come, had therefore some appreciation of His spiritual ministry, and who, even if they did not understand the parables, yet suspected that they contained the key to Jesus' method of founding the kingdom. The result produced by this parable-address therefore must have been what Jesus had in view when He chose this didactic form. He could not intend to employ it in exhibiting a truth to the multitude which His most receptive followers had not yet discovered there. But neither could He communicate this truth to them other than figuratively, for, enveloped as His followers were in their own presuppositions and conceptions, they either could not understand it at all, or if they did so, it would only lead to Jesus being repulsed, and would in consequence produce an open breach with Him who was so far from coming up to their expectations. He therefore wished to incite them by the enigmatical and yet attractive figurative form of His address to conjecture the latent meaning, and to ask for its interpretation. It is not correct to say that the parabolic form at once concealed and unveiled; it neither did the one nor the other. But it was by means of it that Jesus endeavoured so to attract the people that they might desire to understand the highest of spiritual truths; it was the touchstone to show whether they possessed inclination and capability to enter into more minute elucidations of this truth, and was intended to accomplish the separation of the receptive from the non-receptive. The latter listened to these pleasant tales, for a moment were delighted, but when they passed on had forgotten them. The former, however, were arrested; they suspected that yet profounder truths lay behind, and longing to understand them, even if they should run counter to what hitherto had been their conceptions, expectations, and hopes, they came and asked the meaning of the parables. This was the right way to listen; Jesus therefore concluded the first parable with an exhortation to hear correctly (Matt. xiii. 9).

We can now understand the words of Jesus concerning the significance of the parables for the multitude, which have been taken such exception to (Mark iv. 11 f.). To those who are without, says Jesus,—who do not belong to the closer band of followers collected round Jesus and questioning Him,—everything belonging to the mystery of the kingdom is done in parables, *i.e.* in a form which for them renders this secret more obscure. The divine purpose realized therein, Jesus shows by an allusion to a passage in the prophets (Isa. vi. 9 f.) treating of the divine judgment of the obdurate. As little as in His answer to the Baptist does Jesus appeal expressly to this passage in Isaiah, which represents the people who *will* not hear and understand the truth coming at last, according to a fundamental law of divine holiness, to such a condition that they *can* no longer hear and understand. But He indicates that in His parabolic addresses He accomplishes this divine judgment on the unreceptive multitudes, so that they shall see with their eyes and yet perceive nothing of the truth, and shall hear with their ears and yet be without understanding. They who would not themselves turn, shall not now be converted, for that could only have taken place on the ground of a profound apprehension of His ministry; neither shall they receive the forgiveness of their sins, for that could only happen in consequence of their conversion. So it was, that although the multitude had also listened to the parables, they had comprehended nothing that was of any importance, since their non-receptivity for any higher, spiritual matters could not be conquered by any such inciting methods. This has been termed a hypochondriac view, introduced into the words of Jesus by the pessimistic evangelists who despaired of the Jewish nation, and has been mocked at as being non-didactic and lacking in affection; and yet it is nothing more than the profound requital demanded by God's holy law—the punishment of sin with sin, *i.e.* with ever deeper absorption in sin. In contrast with the revelation of salvation, which was being disclosed with increasing distinctness in Jesus' proclamation, must necessarily be the judgment perfected at the same time, which affected the multitude, because they lacked not capacity, but willingness to understand. The crisis was approaching, which would not

only divide the receptive from the callous, but must bring judgment to the latter.[1]

The parabolic form of teaching was therefore the only one through which, according to God's good pleasure, the multitude could hear the word which proclaimed the mystery of the kingdom of God (Mark iv. 33). If this teaching, therefore, was to bring that divine judgment on the non-receptive, so that they should not hear the truth, a proclamation of the same truth, presented unpictorially, would have been just as incomprehensible; this form at least attracted them, and it might fan the last glimmering sparks of readiness to inquire after the truth, and listen to it. Whenever that happened, the way to come and ask was opened to them also; for Jesus explained to His disciples all that He had previously spoken of in parables, and admission to this circle was denied to no one. To the people, however, He spoke in parables only, as Mark expressly says (iv. 34), not, of course, meaning by this all Jesus' popular addresses, but such as referred only to the mystery of the kingdom, *i.e.* to His final purposes in respect of its establishment, as He at that time began to disclose them more distinctly. Jesus must doubtless have explained those parables to His disciples and the others who came to Him when the speech was over; but it can no longer be certainly determined how far He then disclosed the opposition between His conception of the nature and development of the

[1] While even Luke seems to have stumbled at these closing words which refused to grant the people conversion and forgiveness of sins, and therefore to have omitted them (viii. 9 f.), the first evangelist (Matt. xiii. 10–17) has given what is essentially Mark's representation, though his version is shown to be quite secondary in importance. For not only does he say that the disciples were the questioners, but he represents them as asking its meaning after a declaration uttered by Jesus as to the purpose of His parabolic teaching; and then, too, he mentions expressly the non-receptivity of the people as a reason for so acting; and by this quotation from Isaiah he leads back that non-receptivity to the judgment of obduracy threatened there. The evangelist's idea in regard to Jesus' parabolic addresses is, that the people do not understand the appearing of God's judgment because of their obduracy, and that it is and will be unfruitful as far as they are concerned. The hand of the redactor is also manifest in the interweaving of two sayings from the apostolic source—Luke xix. 26 and x. 23 f.—which are there in quite another connection; the first he interprets as referring to those possessing true susceptibility, who receive the exposition of the parables (Matt. xiii. 12); the second, as referring to those whose eyes and ears are open, and who see and hear in the parables what the great men of the Old Covenant had desired in vain (xiii. 16 f.).

kingdom of God and theirs, which made parabolic addresses necessary. We cannot tell if by the explanation and application of detached portions of these parables He led His auditors to the consideration of questions concerning spiritual life, so that from these parables they learnt to understand that the principal matter was the founding and development of this life in the kingdom of God, as Jesus apprehended it. It is involved in the nature of the case that explanatory elucidation connected with such questions made as little impression either upon the memory of His auditors or upon evangelical tradition as did the exposition of Holy Writ which Jesus gave in the synagogues. It is therefore very doubtful how far the reports of such explanations which are given in our Gospels can claim to be literal tradition. It is true that we must not at once deny the possibility of Jesus having seized upon some features in the parabolic figures in order, by means of an allegorizing interpretation, to make them so far productive for His disciples, that it answered to the previous standpoint of their capacity for apprehension, and so to lead them gradually to a complete understanding of the addresses themselves. But, on the other hand, we perceive that allegorizing colouring and application has undoubtedly found its way into our evangelical tradition; and an explanation which is more serviceable for edification than for elucidating their historical purpose corresponds so completely to the literary intentions of the evangelists, that it seems as if we might see in interpretations of parables attempts, made by the evangelists themselves, which rather rest upon isolated traditional reminiscences than on faithfully literal reports of Jesus' explanations.

But if the exposition which Mark gives of the first parable (iv. 13–20; comp. p. 206, note) was founded upon reminiscences of what Peter related about this conversation between Jesus and His disciples, it is evident that the first evangelist was only induced by Mark's concluding remark (iv. 33 f.) to add some more examples of how Jesus explained the parables to His disciples.[1] At this point the explanation

[1] It is here that the evangelist shows himself most clearly as the redactor of Mark, from whom he borrows, in a polished form, the interpretation of the first parable (Matt. xiii. 18–23). The following series of sayings, which show in Mark how the meaning which was first given to the disciples only was intended

passes entirely into an allegorizing exposition of separate incidents.[1] It is evident that the allegorical incident of the enemy is only interwoven in order to show how it is through Satan's counteraction that wickedness forces its way into the kingdom of God; the all-embracing sense of the parable is here narrowed to a polemic against certain evil-doers who in the evangelists' time were a cause of vexation to the Church (xiii. 41); there is now no mention of the mystery of the kingdom which, according to His own statement, Jesus desired to proclaim, but both expositions proceed, in almost identical words, to an edifying description of the final decision and separation.

ultimately to be universally known, and the exhortation with which the first evangelist concludes (Matt. xiii. 9), is there explained to mean that the profounder intelligence bestowed on any one depends on the degree he has heard correctly (Mark iv. 21–25); this is omitted by the first evangelist, because he recognises in it an independent series of sayings from the apostolic source, which he has already borrowed, and the most of them in their original connection (Matt. v. 15, x. 26, vii. 2, xiii. 12); after that, however, he takes the parable of the tares from Mark, and adds to it those of the mustard-seed and leaven (Matt. xiii. 24–33; comp. p. 208, note). Although he afterwards adds the three other parables of the oldest source, which do not precisely seem as if addressed to the disciples, thereby making up the number seven, he introduces here Mark's closing remark, by pointing out how Jesus' parabolic addresses were the fulfilment of Ps. lxxviii. 2 (Matt. xiii. 34); he also exemplifies Jesus' interpretation of the parables by giving an exposition of the parables of the tares and the draw-net (xiii. 37–43, 49 f.), which corresponds, almost word for word, with the evangelist's mode of expression and his doctrinal conceptions, so that it cannot really have originated in the source.

[1] How little it is founded upon the parable is shown by the good seed being at one time the word of Jesus, at another intercourse between the subjects of the kingdom, secured through it; the field is at one time the world in which Jesus establishes His kingdom, at another the kingdom itself, from which the godless shall one day be removed; the seeds of tares are at one time the evil which the devil scatters in the hearts of men, at another the evil one himself, whose entrance into the kingdom of God meets with its due retribution; the harvest is at one time the end of the world, and at another the judgment which is then to take place. There is no proof needed, however, that the sending forth of the reapers, which in the parabolic figure only signifies the commencement of harvest, is not intended to point to the Messiah.

# CHAPTER III.

## THE FIRST FAILURE.

TRADITION still preserves a recollection of how, on the evening of the day that Jesus addressed the people exclusively in parables, He bade His disciples cross the lake to the country on the other side Jordan (Mark iv. 35).[1] There, in the territory of the Tetrarch Herod, stretched large tracts of country belonging to a confederation, originally consisting of ten cities, not geographically, but politically united — the so-called Decapolis. These cities had a population predominantly Grecian, and possessed their own form of government, although nominally under the Roman governor of Syria. In this region the Jewish population had, of course, a much larger Gentile intermixture than anywhere else in Palestine, and therefore the district bore in a peculiar degree the character of those apostate classes which were so unutterably despised by those faithful to the law (comp. p. 122 f.). When Jesus proposed to visit this district, He would certainly not have in view the Gentile population, but those depraved ones of His own nation whom He sought out so lovingly in His intercourse with the publicans and sinners of Galilee.

Many of those to whom He had explained the parables

[1] The fact of this expedition impressed itself on tradition from its being the solitary instance of the kind occurring during the ministry of Jesus on the north-west shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, and because of the unique circumstances attending it, and the account of it in the oldest source probably followed the parable speech ; only so can it be explained how Mark, who is undoubtedly acquainted with the event, although his account is enriched by many details from Petrine tradition (iv. 35, v. 20), should give its chronological connection with occurrences which he noted with it only for topical reasons (iv. 35). The first evangelist has given the account of this expedition almost entirely after the oldest source, and introduces it into his great description of Jesus' ministry of healing as an example of expulsion of demons (Matt. viii. 18-34).

were still collected about Him when He gave His disciples the command to cross to the other side. One of those followers—a scribe, and therefore one of the few in his position who were interested by Jesus—had probably long cherished a desire to enter into closer fellowship with Him, and now seized this opportunity of asking whether he might join the number of Jesus' constant associates, and accompany them on the contemplated journey. Jesus, who was assuredly rejoiced at this offer, regarded it as His duty to remind this man, whose expectations were probably high in regard to his career in life, how the life involved by His calling, and in which His constant companions were obliged to share, was a wandering existence, with no room for ordinary domestic comforts. The foxes have their holes, and the birds of the air their nests; but the Son of man is compelled by His unique calling to abstain from that in which all other sons of men rejoice—He hath not where to lay His head (Matt. viii. 18–20).[1] The oldest source, which had regard only to Jesus' important words, does not say whether the scribe was thereby discouraged, or whether he entered the circle of disciples. But it is manifest from the offer, as well as from Jesus' reply, that the circle of the twelve apostles was not yet completed, so that entrance into it was still possible.

The original source united with this incident another, which showed likewise that even those who were called by Jesus into His more intimate companionship were not yet accustomed to follow Him solely, and to make everything give way to that. For example, one of those disciples asked permission to attend his father's funeral, which would have entailed a delay in his joining the company. He manifestly felt the command to depart as binding him to make the journey with the others, but hoped that permission would be accorded him for the sake of his filial duty, and that Jesus would appoint a place where He could afterwards be met.

[1] These words were certainly induced by the situation, for Jesus was just on the point of setting out for the inhospitable region of the eastern shore, without knowing whether He would meet with any reception there, or if so, of what kind it would be. Surely, however, He would not have mentioned it as a general rule if He had had His fixed residence in Capernaum (comp. p. 104, note).

We do not know what particular reasons Jesus had for refusing this request; but it almost appears as if the fulfilment of his filial duty was only a pretext covering the man's disinclination to accompany Jesus upon this vague journey. In any case, Jesus elsewhere required of His disciples that they should place their duty towards Him above all natural calls (Matt. x. 37); and we can understand this if He early accustomed them to do so. In this case, He explained His refusal by saying how reasonable it was that the dead should be left to bury their dead (Matt. viii. 21 f.). All who have not yet experienced in themselves Jesus' spiritual ministry are without the true higher life (comp. p. 131), and may — since they know of no higher duties — busy themselves constantly in duties towards the dead, which are the more incumbent upon them from the close connection existing between the dead and themselves. It may have been on some such occasion as this that Jesus spoke the words: "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 62). What the request suggested, was attachment to the old natural relationships; and that could only prejudice entire resignation to Jesus. Jesus, however, demanded undivided confidence.[1]

In this case also the oldest source, with its carelessness

[1] The two incidents, which must have been narrated in this place by the oldest source, since the first evangelist had no manner of inducement to interweave them in the connection in which he gives them, may have been linked together by the source out of topical reasons and inserted here, for, like the parables of the treasure and of the pearl, they show what it costs to become, and to continue, a disciple of Jesus. But both occurrences are in perfect correspondence with this situation, while in Luke they appear most unsuitably at the commencement of Jesus' wanderings after the close of the Galilean ministry (Luke ix. 57–60), for at that time the circle of the twelve apostles had long been closed, and to join it again, after leaving for a time, was hardly possible. The last portion in the first great intercalation, which Luke borrows from the oldest source, was formed by the parable of the sower (viii. 4–8); and since this is the beginning of the second, in which he preponderatingly follows this source (comp. vol. i. p. 77), it is evident that he had there read them in the same connection with the parable-speech. And besides, it is certain that he no longer had a correct perception of the presuppositions of the second incident, and taken thus it must have been preceded by a command to the second disciple to follow Jesus. And then, too, what he gives as the occasion of the saying in ix. 52, is plainly nothing but a literary combination in which the motives of the first two sayings (vv. 57–59) are gathered together (ix. 61).

as to the details of the situation, relates simply that Jesus entered into a boat with His disciples (Matt. viii. 23), while we know from Mark that Jesus had just been teaching the multitude from the boat. It is evident that the latter evangelist had, thanks to Peter's account, the whole situation vividly before him. He represents the shadows of evening as falling when Jesus gave the order to depart. The fact of their being in the boat already made it easier for the little company to get away from the crowd, who usually kept Jesus detained with all manner of appeals; they now left the people on the shore, and put out to sea. But the multitude would not desist from accompanying Him at least a part of the way; and the vessel was surrounded by barks until, driven by the powerful strokes of the able-bodied fishermen, it disappeared from sight (Mark v. 35 f.). Like all mountain lakes, Gennesareth is subject to violent and sudden storms of wind and rain, which are extremely dangerous for craft. Such a storm now suddenly arose, the waves rolled high, and menaced with destruction the tiny bark that was now filling with water, and was holding on its course with great difficulty. Jesus, worn out with the labours of the day, had lain down in the stern of the vessel, upon the steersman's pillow, and was now asleep (Mark iv. 37 f.; comp. Matt. viii. 24). Need had reached its height when the disciples, impelled by an obscure feeling that if deliverance was still possible it could only come through Him, resolved to rouse Jesus with the cry of distress, "Master, we perish." But surely they should have known all the time that the God-sent Deliverer of His people could not perish in a storm at sea; that was the reason why Jesus, on being aroused, said to them, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" (Matt. viii. 25 f.; comp. Mark iv. 40).[1]

[1] What the disciples said to Jesus has been preserved by Luke in its most original form (Luke viii. 24), while Mark gives it somewhat the cast of a gentle reproof (Mark iv. 38), and the first evangelist makes it a direct petition (Matt. viii. 25). Even the words of Jesus present the different reflections of the evangelists as to the condition of the disciples' faith, for that is characterized by Mark and Luke as entire lack of faith, by the first evangelist as little faith. In other respects the latter must be regarded as having preserved most purely the form of the original account, although, like Luke, he has taken the threatening of the storm from Mark, as is apparent from the peculiar expression employed, although without the words in which Mark clothes the threatening (see next page).

These words, spoken amid the raging of the elements to weather-beaten fishermen, who knew only too well how to estimate the danger of the situation, show that Jesus did not rely with wavering confidence upon divine assistance, and that He expected His disciples to have the same trust that He possessed, thereby conquering all fear. His bold reliance upon God was rewarded,—His disciples shall be shown by a divine miracle how foolish their fear has been. Scarcely had Jesus spoken, when suddenly the wind ceased, the waves were still, and the voyage was safely over.

The oldest source related that, to the people who heard how the calm had followed directly upon Jesus' bold words of confidence, it seemed as if He had Himself commanded the winds and the waves (Matt. viii. 27). Mark's description of the same occurrence is manifestly guided by this view. He represents Jesus as commanding the winds and waves with the words, "Peace, be still" (Mark iv. 39). It is evident, however, that this description cannot be the original one, for Jesus' words of reproach were plainly spoken to the still terrified disciples, while Mark, and following him Luke, represents them as being uttered after the calm had set in,—guided in this plainly by the idea that the disciples were only then in a condition to receive the correct impression of what the words were intended to convey. More particularly, however, he is the first to assume as a fact that Jesus expressly commanded the storm.[1] But this view is opposed by most serious objections. Since it is a matter of course that any effect of divine power exercised by Jesus upon lifeless nature could not be wrought by a single word in human language, the expression of any such threatening could only have been with the purpose of showing His disciples that He quieted the storm of the elements by His own perfect authority. It may be a mistake to suppose that there was anything ostentatious in Jesus' not regarding it as worth while—in view of His didactic aim—to avoid the appearance of this. But the reason for our receiving this conception so readily is the same which weighed with the evangelists, viz. that the picture of the Christ exalted to divine power and majesty is involuntarily introduced into our conception of the course of events. But assuredly there was

[1] [See note on preceding page.]

no correspondence here with the picture of the Son of man as given us in the Gospels. He who promised His disciples that they should see the angels of God descending upon Him in order to bring divine miraculous aid (John i. 51), who proved to the Pharisees that He drove out devils by the Spirit of God (Matt. xii. 28), and who asserted by the grave that God would raise up Lazarus in answer to His prayer (John xi. 41), cannot in the days of His flesh have commanded the elements with divine omnipotence, although it has often been thought possible to establish through this incident sensible proofs of His originally divine nature, the certainty of which must rest on surer grounds. No prayerful cry from Jesus can be intercalated here, for our evangelists are ignorant of one having been offered. Jesus, indeed, regarded the terror of the disciples as foolish; He knew that, according to the counsel of Him who directs the winds and the waves, He could not Himself be in any danger, or in need of any special miracle. And when, notwithstanding, a miracle of such peculiar divine providence took place, it was on account of the disciples; the Father for their sakes confirmed the word of His Son in a way which was in after days a stay and support to their faith in many an hour of sore conflict.

It is undoubtedly true that the presuppositions which alone explain the preservation of this recollection, as well as the rise of the latter conception of an exertion of power by Jesus Himself, are these—the fact of a miracle happening, and of the storm not ceasing fortuitously, and also that it was the words of Jesus which were confirmed by the safe conclusion of the voyage. According to the older Rationalists, Jesus had only read from the signs of the weather more correctly than the old seafaring fishermen. It is forgotten, however, that to the weather-beaten fishermen, among whom the oldest tradition originated, a stormy night upon the Lake of Gennesareth, even although so serious that they believed themselves obliged to awaken Jesus, was not such an extraordinary occurrence that their excited accounts of it could have given rise to a legend, representing them as only being saved by a miraculous exercise of power either by God or by Jesus. The only thing therefore left for those who insist on getting rid of the miraculous element, is to pro-

nounce the narrative to be a purely symbolic fiction; and that we have already seen is impossible owing to the time when our tradition originated, and is in this place inconceivable, for this narrative is no mere fanciful picture, but in the Petrine tradition is connected with a definite day and a peculiarly distinct locality.[1]

Mark particularly describes the spot where they landed on the eastern shore as the country of Gerasa: we must not suppose that this means the well-known place on the eastern frontier of Perea, but it is believed possible to identify it in the ruins of Kersa, on the eastern shore of the lake, which present a steep precipice, just as the following narrative presupposes.[2] From the caves which were there hewn in the rock, or formed by natural grottoes, a man possessed by

[1] Even Strauss has acknowledged that this is no imitation of the boat carrying Cæsar and his fortunes, or of any of the many legends of the powers which govern the elements. In this case, too, Hengstenberg pointed out the way to criticism when he supposed that through the stilling of the sea Jesus desired to apply to Himself the glorious description in Ps. cvii. 23 f., of Jehovah's dominion over the storm and waves. According to the improbable supposition, that even then this psalm was interpreted as referring to Israel's deliverance, the Christian Church is said to have appropriated the incident to itself, and to have seen in the tiny bark struggling through the waves the picture of the Church which the Messiah will assuredly guide safely through all dangers. This story of the rise of our narrative is, as Strauss now relates it, burdened with a clumsy contradiction; for any one who applied the description of the psalm to himself would apprehend it figuratively, and would never infer that, being a type, it had to happen literally during Jesus' earthly life. Still, however, this psalm, as well as the Old Testament figurative language in general, offered colouring for such a poetical conception if, at the period when our tradition took its rise, the life of Jesus could have been made the subject of pure fiction.

[2] It is neither conceivable that Mark, who belonged to the country by birth, and who everywhere shows himself well acquainted with Palestine, can have made any mistake, nor can there in his case be any dubiety as to the reading according to the oldest records. As the oldest source may very probably have given no particular description of the locality, the first evangelist, having those readers in view who had no acquaintance with this insignificant place, has correctly described the region as the country of the Gadarenes, because that was included in the territory belonging to the well-known capital of Perea (Matt. viii. 28); it may be, however, that this gave rise to the mistaken notion that it referred to the neighbourhood of the city subsequently mentioned in his source (ver. 34), for which Gadara was too far distant. The irremediable confusion in the orthography of these names in the manuscripts of all our three Gospels has arisen from this difference between the first two Gospels and an unfortunate conjecture of Origen, who thought of the Old Testament Girgashites (comp. Josh. xxiv. 11).

devils came to meet them when they landed; from Mark's detailed description, which necessarily rests upon the tradition of an eye-witness, it appears that there was only one demoniac, and that his insanity took the form of hatred to man, for there is no trace of any inclination to communicate with them. The oldest source undoubtedly told of *one* demoniac who was sorely afflicted (Matt. viii. 28), and by this apparently had such a case in view as, judging from the man's own declaration in Mark (Mark v. 9), this appears to have been; for in the Gospels we hear of degrees of demoniacal possession only in so far as certain of those unfortunates believed themselves possessed by a plurality of demons. The condition of this unfortunate man shows all the symptoms of mania. Attempts had frequently been made to bind him with fetters and chains of every description; but with the supernatural power usually possessed by such maniacs, he had torn his chains asunder, and broken his fetters in the paroxysm of his wrath; and now there was no one strong enough who would undertake to bind him. We also learn incidentally (Mark v. 15) that in his attacks of fury he had, along with his chains, torn the clothes from his body; with feelings of intense hatred against his fellow-men, he had taken refuge in the wild cliffs above the margin of the lake, where day and night he roamed about naked, seeking refuge perhaps in the caves, crying out and cutting himself with stones in his rabid fury, as if he desired to deaden his inward torments through bodily pain, or to vent his hatred to mankind upon himself (Mark v. 3–5).[1]

[1] The assumption that Mark only intended to heighten the hideousness of the appearance by uniting what was frightful in two cases into one, is absolutely preposterous. Mere reduplication cannot mean enhancement, and the omission of the case of the demoniac in the synagogue does not require to be compensated for in the case of an evangelist who has repeatedly told of expulsions of demons (Matt. iv. 24, viii. 16); the fact of the first evangelist speaking of two demoniacs can be most easily accounted for by supposing that he had no longer a correct apprehension of the meaning of the expression in Matt. viii. 28, and inferred a plurality of demoniacs, for afterwards in his source mention is always made of a plurality. The fancy entertained by harmonists of there really being two cases, but that only one demoniac spoke or was distinguished by any particular savagery, needs no refutation. The hand of the evangelist is also apparent in the remark that no one dared to pass that way for fear of the madman's outbreaks.

Now, however, the madman recognises in Jesus the Chosen of God, although He had never been in this neighbourhood before, and it was long since the demoniac had exchanged words with any fellow-creature who might have given him tidings of the appearance of the Messiah. It is owing to the influence of the Satanic power ruling him that on account of natural antipathy he sees in Jesus the conqueror of Satan his addressing Jesus by name is probably only the involuntary supposition of the younger narrator, who has in his mind the incident in the synagogue (Mark i. 24). Instead of fleeing over the mountains so as to escape as far as may be from Him whom he sees from afar, the man hurries down and falls at Jesus' feet; manifesting in this case also a strange twofold consciousness by reason of which the unfortunate being, aware of his frightful condition, felt himself in one respect drawn to the Messiah as to a deliverer from this sore need. But again, so soon as Jesus volunteered to expel the devil from the lunatic whom He recognised as being possessed, the man, overcome by Satanic power, recoils with terror, uttering a wild cry; appealing as it were from the Chosen of God to the great God Himself, he adjured Jesus not to torment him (Mark v. 6–8).[1] It is perhaps to assuage the last paroxysm, which was almost always produced by the expulsion, that Jesus enters into conversation with the lunatic, and agrees so far with his fixed idea as to ask for his name. For He knows the demoniac understands that to mean the name of the evil spirit or spirits with whom, in accordance with the way in which he appealed to Jesus, he identifies himself. His answer therefore runs thus: "My name is Legion: for we are many." As a Roman legion presents a unity consisting of many individuals, so it

[1] This representation is certainly not a mere exaggerated description of demoniacal homage, for it betrays the presence of eye-witnesses, and is therefore not intended as an explanation of the contradictory conduct of the demoniac; even the short word by which the oldest source represents the sorely-afflicted man as warding off Jesus' approach (Matt. viii. 29), expresses in the clearest way how the demoniacal powers which rule him know that the appearance of the Messiah is destined to put an end to their dominion, but do not wish to be tormented before their time; it shows, too, that they are hindered from delighting themselves in the tortures of the men who are possessed by them.

seems to him as if the frightful force with which the Satanic power holds him bound is like a whole army of demons which had made their dwelling within him. But in their united name the demoniac beseeches Jesus not to send them out of the country; because, according to the popular idea, desert regions are their favourite abode, and because the lunatic, who has long been accustomed to dwell on those dreary heights, identifies his desire of remaining in the neighbourhood with that of the demons, and therefore does not wish them to be expelled the country (Mark v. 9 f.).[1] This talk with the demoniac is the more certainly historical, as it gives the explanation of the departure taken directly after the outcry of the demoniac by the sketchy representation of the oldest source. For we see from it how it occurred to the demoniac, feeling himself in Jesus' power, to think of what shall become of the evil spirits if they are actually driven out of him.

At some little distance on the mountain side a herd of swine was feeding; there is no contradiction in the oldest report laying special stress on the fact that the devils saw these creatures from afar, while Mark simply states that they were on the spot (Matt. viii. 30; Mark v. 11).[2] We can easily understand how herds of swine, although looked upon by the Jews with loathing as being unclean animals, were kept in a district where the population was so largely Gentile, and how the demoniac could arrive at the idea that the unclean spirits with whom he identified himself could be sent into the herd of swine if once they were driven out of him, so that they should no longer betray and torment humanity, and yet have, if they desired, a place to exercise their activity. Indeed, this is only another manifestation of that weird two-

[1] Luke substituted for this the wish of the demons not to be sent to the abyss (Luke viii. 31), on account of his Gentile-Christian readers, who were unable to understand the request, as the popular notion was unknown to them.

[2] The statement as to the number which Mark gives incidentally (v. 13), and which modern criticism desires to connect in some way with the legion of demons, although there was no resemblance whatever between the herd and the number of a Roman legion in any age, and which others charge with exaggeration, rests, of course, not on the enumeration made by the eye-witnesses, but on the complaints of those in charge, who may conceivably have exaggerated the loss they had sustained.

fold consciousness which in this request shows itself possessed of a suspicion as to the way in which the unfortunate hoped to be delivered from the evil spirits, as on the other hand he beseeches in their name and in their interest for a new dwelling-place (Matt. viii. 31). That Jesus *permitted* them to enter the swine (Mark v. 13) is plainly the notion of the later narrator; it does not answer to their request, for that asked a *command* to this end from Jesus when they felt His power working within them. According to the oldest source, Jesus performed the expulsion with a simple "Go;" but even it told how the demons entered into the herd of swine, and how, actuated by the powers of Satan whose pleasure is found in destruction, they rushed down the steep into the sea, and perished miserably in the waters (Matt. viii. 32). This incident has in every age exhausted the witticism of the critic and apologist, although they have never been able to free it from difficulties.[1] But both forget to ask whether the eye-witnesses could reasonably have supposed or the narrators reasonably attributed to them the supposition that they saw how the demons entered into the swine. Since it can be easily understood that neither case is possible, we have plainly to do in this case with an idea of the narrator's own, explaining in this way the fact that the terrified animals in their

[1] At one time criticism scoffed at the dumb devils who destroyed the instruments of their pleasure, at another at the cunning of the worker of the miracle who lured them on to destruction, that they might go straight to hell with the raging animals; sometimes critics have seen in this only a poor Jewish witticism, representing the damnation of the Gentiles as well as the loss of their loathsome property; at other times, a test for confirming the reality of the expulsion, for even Jewish exorcists were in the habit of turning a water vessel or a statue upside down to the devil who had been expelled. Apologetics has taken great pains in inquiring as to the possibility of demoniacal possession even in the case of animals, and as to the probability of the devils not having calculated correctly the effect produced by their evil tempers on the nervous system of the creatures. In opposition to the denunciations of criticism against the damage done to the property of the Gerasenes, which curiously enough do not come from those who sustained loss, apologetics appeals at one time to the divine right belonging to the Son of God, at another to the just punishment of the illegal breeding of swine—although it is nowhere said that the swine belonged to Jews; sometimes the appeal is made to the salutary trial which directed their consciences to heavenly things by reason of the loss of temporal goods—although it is well known that this good intention met with no success; at others to the support given to the cure by acquiescence in the lunatic's idea—a help which Jesus needed in no other of His exorcisms.

confusion rushed down the steep and were drowned in the lake. But this idea could only arise if the occurrence which led to the loss of the herd was not entirely accidental, but was actually connected in some way with the expulsion of demons; the fact of the matter must therefore be that the lunatic, when in the last paroxysm which usually attended recovery, flung himself into the herd, and drove them down the steep, in consistency with his idea that the demons must necessarily enter the swine. The whole narrative, like the demoniac himself, identifies the speaking and acting man with the demons who were in him, and this action is therefore regarded as an effect produced by the demons who had gone out of him. No blame, however, attached to Jesus in regard to this catastrophe.

If we look upon this case as merely one of the most important and vivid examples which are given of expulsions of demons, Strauss' newest criticism affords us the means of apprehending this "magnificent fragment" of the realm of legends, which had previously to endure his weakest ridicule, as a profound allegorical fiction. The demoniac in the country of the Gentiles is, according to this theory, a picture of heathendom itself, which has broken all the chains of its own legal statutes, and for which with all its "nastiness," *lit.* hoggishness, Jesus has prepared the way for destruction; while afterwards we are supposed to rediscover in the convalescent, whom Jesus charged with a mission to his countrymen, a picture of converted heathendom. For the support of this fancy, however, which even Strauss goes too far in carrying out, there is not the slightest indication in our narrative of the indispensable presupposition that the demoniac was a Gentile. Indeed, that is plainly precluded by the whole story, although such a statement might have been introduced there with great facility, since the evangelical tradition represents Jesus as according to individual Gentiles the benefits of His ministry of healing. The demoniac's idea that the Messiah would come to put an end to Satan's kingdom is a peculiarly Jewish one; and even in the mouth of the Gentile-Christian narrator the great God is no other than Jehovah (Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35), while the appellation of the Messiah as Son of God is as certainly a token of

Jewish knowledge, as that the notion of the swine as unclean animals having an affinity with the unclean spirits could only occur to the demoniac because of his Jewish training. Without regarding its connection with a locality which is otherwise perfectly unknown to evangelical tradition, critics such as Keim have given up the idea of our narrative being pure fiction because of its conclusion. That is as difficult to explain by the motives of any allegorical fiction as by the simple expulsion of demons, to which Keim would refer all that he considers is really founded upon fact; but indeed the latter is needed to explain the destruction of the herd — the part of the narrative which presents most difficulty.

The oldest source gave a very summary account of the issue of the story (Matt. viii. 33 f.), and its significance was first recognised by Mark, who introduced it where he wished to describe the commencement of the non-receptivity which Jesus encountered even in regard to His ministry of healing. This was indeed the first occasion on which He was repelled— He who had hitherto roused wherever He went the greatest enthusiasm. When the herdsmen saw what had happened to the swine, they fled to the city with their strange intelligence. The whole population, proceeding eagerly to the spot, beheld there the lunatic, whom the herdsmen had just seen falling upon the herd in his fury, now seated quietly, clothed and in his right mind. Only now is the connection apparent between the expulsion of demons and the destruction of the herd. But the inhabitants of the city are seized with a foolish fear of the miracle-worker. What care they for the unfortunate being who has so long been shut out from human society ? They only think of the awful destruction of their herd, the damage to their property, and the further loss which might result from the presence of this miracle-worker, and therefore they beseech Him to depart from their borders (Mark v. 14–17). This was the first great failure. Love, desirous of seeking and saving the most miserable of His people, had taken Jesus to that land beyond Jordan, and there for the first time He found, instead of gratitude and desire for further aid, the coldness and antipathy which spring from low self-interest and attachment to the things of earth.

He had no desire to force His way, and when opposed by such glaring indifference, He regarded the ground as not yet ripe for His ministry; therefore entering the boat again, He turned His face homewards. There was still one thing He could do for this unhappy people. When the man who was cured prayed to be permitted to join His constant associates, Jesus forbade him, and bid him remain behind as a witness of the divine miracle which he had experienced, and as messenger to his friends of the salvation which had appeared (Mark v. 18–20).[1]

The hope with which Jesus left in Decapolis this messenger of salvation was not disappointed. It was here, in this very district, that the case occurred of that deaf-mute whose tongue Jesus wet with saliva, and whose ears He touched (comp. p. 97 f.). Was it perhaps the remembrance of the non-receptivity He had once before met with in this region which led Him on this occasion to look up to heaven, breathing a peculiarly earnest prayer to His Father? But when He knew that His Father has heard Him, and has granted the needful result to the touch which was employed as the means for healing, He said unto the man, Ephphatha, *i.e.* be opened. He bade the unhappy man, who was excluded from all impressions from the outer world, as far as hearing was concerned, open it himself; and the fact of the man hearing the words that Jesus addressed to him was the token of his recovery. Following immediately upon this, however, the tongue, which in consequence of the man's deafness had never been used for speech, and on that account was as if paralysed, was loosed from its bands, and the man spoke, not in stammering accents, such as are usually attempted by deaf-mutes, but quite articulately (Mark vii. 31–35). With his usual thoughtfulness, Mark lays stress upon the fact that the return

[1] Since Jesus expressly gives this as the motive of His refusal, any further speculations are valueless. We know that the man who was cured was not a Gentile; and to say that from therapeutic reasons the quietness of his own hearth and healthy employment were better for him than the exciting wandering life of Jesus, presupposes some strange ideas as to the permanency of the cure and the effects of close association with Jesus. The utmost which can be said is, that Jesus needed for His apostles thoroughly healthy natures, and that even a radical cure seldom quite removed the traces of such a past as that man's had been.

for *this* miracle was not coldness and aversion, but as soon as it was noised abroad, the people were at one in their amazement and laudation, saying, "He hath done all things well; He maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak" (vii. 37). But at that period it was too late, the time had long gone by when the sower scattered the good seed along with instruction and healing. Jesus had already closed His popular ministry; and when, touched with sympathy, He gave assistance to the unhappy man, it was with misgivings that the action would give rise to new claims on His healing activity (vv. 33–36; comp. Book V. chap. x.).

## CHAPTER IV.

### SABBATARIAN CONTROVERSY.

JESUS had returned again to Capernaum: in the house where He dwelt many followers had presented themselves, desiring to hear Him; and while He taught in the midst of a great crowd of auditors, the multitude continued rapidly to increase. The door was of necessity left open, for even the vestibule was filled by people anxious to catch a word. It was now that a man sick of the palsy, lying upon a couch carried by four bearers, was brought to the place; he had probably heard of Jesus' return, and desired that this time His presence should not be allowed to pass without an effort being made to reach Him. It may be that this was not the first time he had made the attempt; but perhaps his couch had always been kept back by the throng of the seekers for help. Only yesterday it had seemed perfectly impossible to force a way through to Jesus; but the sufferer was either in such a condition as to make prompt assistance necessary, or else must have feared that he should again be hindered by the crowd which was bent on the same errand as he was. Necessity is the mother of invention. The bed was carried to the flat roof of the house, by means of the steps leading up from the street: by removing the tiles of the floor, and raising the layer of laths underneath, a portion of the roof was taken off, and through the opening so made the sufferer's couch was let down into the room where Jesus was teaching (Mark ii. 1–4).[1]

Critics, such as Weisse and Volkmar, have sneered at the

[1] It is not to be supposed, however, that this scene was an impromptu invention by Mark, in order, as it is alleged, to illustrate the faith of the bearers, which was greatly extolled even in the oldest source, especially as the man they carried gave no evidence of faith, but only of a burning desire for aid. From the way in which the first evangelist inserts the narrative (Matt. ix. 2–6), it appears to have directly followed in that source upon the expedition to the

solicitude which even present-day criticism has evinced about the danger of this operation for those who were underneath. It is surely reasonable to suppose that a native of Palestine, such as Mark, would know better than we do what with care was practicable in an Oriental house. The complaint about destruction of property is met by the consideration that we do not know in what relation these people stood to the owner of the house, and besides, that the cure of the sufferer was to them worth the cost of repairing the roof.

From the fact of their coming to Him for aid, Jesus perceived their faith, and determined to render assistance; but that heart-searching glance of His saw at the same time that the paralytic was conscious of having brought on his sufferings through his own sins, perhaps by reason of licentious courses, and that this consciousness weighed upon him more than the misery of his sufferings. The first thing to be done, then, was to arouse the hope of there still being help even for him, and that was the reason why Jesus addressed to him the announcement, "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee." These words gave great offence to some scribes sitting among the crowd, who perhaps had come there more to spy than to listen. To them it seemed like blasphemy for a man to presume to bestow the forgiveness of sins,—a prerogative of God alone,—which was besides provided for by the divinely-commanded sacrifice. Mark's explanation of the thoughts of the scribes is therefore perfectly correct (ii. 6 f.; comp. Matt. ix. 2 f.). In this case, too, Jesus perceived how they reasoned within themselves; but He also knew how to deal with their anger, which was not without some justification, so long as they did not acknowledge Him as sent from God. He therefore started the question whether it was easier to say, "Thy sins are forgiven," or, "Arise and walk." As regards the mere words, both were manifestly alike easy, and they were equally difficult if said with any result,—for this divine authority was requisite. The sole difference is, that in

eastern shore, particularly as he gives a very short account of them both. Mark inserts it before Jesus' conflicts with the Pharisees had begun, for in this case they do not venture to say a word. It is uncertain whether Jesus stood in the upper room, if indeed the house possessed one of the kind; the description given of the throng in the vestibule rather tells against this view.

the one case the result of the divine authorization of the word is visible, and can be criticized accordingly. This was why He bade the paralytic, who previously had been unable to move, to rise, take up his bed, and go to his house. It happened as Jesus had said; and some of the spectators praised God, who had bestowed upon a man such a twofold power; while others were seized with fear, because they had accused of blasphemy one who so distinctly proved that His authority to do so was no pretence (Matt. ix. 4–7).

It is evident that Jesus could not carry out any operation of healing which was possible to Him by reason of His superhuman spiritual influence, acting through natural psychological means, as a proof of the divine authority to which He laid claim. He certainly does not wish to lead the scribes from their correct idea, that it is blasphemy for a man, not differing from his fellows, to attribute to himself the divine prerogative of forgiving sins. But then, Jesus is not a man such as others are. He is the man, unique of His kind, whom Jehovah promised to send to bring about the consummation of salvation, and who was also to bring His people the forgiveness of their sins, that they might be cleansed from the stain of guilt, and so made fit for the greatest blessing their God had to give. It is perfectly true, however, that only God in heaven can forgive sins; but He bestowed on His last and greatest ambassador the power of forgiving sins on earth, *i.e.* to proclaim the forgiveness of sins to all who are truly repentant. In order to prove this, Jesus was also invested with visible authority to proclaim to the paralytic God's miraculous help, and in the power of it to bid him walk. Only if the cure wrought on the paralytic is such a divine act as is the forgiveness of sins, can Jesus give it as a proof that He possessed authority for that also. This is not such a story of healing as Strauss would say had been invented as a fulfilment of Isa. xxxv. 6; we find in it words of Jesus, called for by the fact of the cure; these could not have been invented, and are corroborated by the oldest tradition.[1]

[1] The older Rationalism suggested that Jesus cleared the sufferer from the suspicion that his malady was the result of sin, and thereby relieved him from

The dispute about the power to forgive sins was, however, only a kind of prelude to a much more momentous controversy. It was true that even the prophets had undoubtedly proclaimed the forgiveness of sins in the name of God (2 Sam. xii. 13); and although as the unique Son of man Jesus laid claim to be more than a prophet, yet whatever He said about His authority involved a claim to a divine mission. Such a claim could not be disputed without inquiry, or characterized as a crime, particularly if it was apparently confirmed by divine assistance. But we have seen already how a much worse dispute would inevitably arise in regard to another point (comp. p. 168 f.)—concerning the question of Sabbath observance. As we know, Jesus had already been involved in many conflicts with those who passed for authorities with the people. But certainly no law could be found in the Thorah prohibiting intercourse with publicans and sinners; and however vexatious it must have been for the Pharisees when Jesus disregarded their traditional statutes, yet they were only a school, although the dominant one. The Sabbath ordinance, however, was part of the divine law; in the Old Testament it was proclaimed as the really fundamental law of the Old Covenant—the eternal sign between Jehovah and His people (Ex. xxxi. 13–17). Jesus' more independent and spiritual way of obeying and teaching the fulfilment of the Sabbath ordinance offered such a radical contradiction to the death-like literality of that age, that the scribes and Pharisees could scarcely help seeing in it unmistakeable infringements of the command. He had certainly endeavoured to show repeatedly that His view was the original one, and that it was in agreement with the intention of the Old Testament Lawgiver. But what just

melancholic mistrust of his own power; the newer Rationalism speaks of the forgiveness of sins, which like an electric current passed through his paralysed nervous system. It knows what the evangelical report is ignorant of, that the paralysis was not of long standing, nor of a severe character, and that the causes were not permanent. And it comforts itself by referring to the serious case of a hysterical girl who had long been unable to stand upon her feet, and yet was made to do so by a shock from an electric machine. But it is overlooked in saying this that Jesus simply deceived either Himself or others, if He represented the natural effect of words of comfort and consolation as being proof of an authority, the divine bestowal of which could only prove an equally God-given restoration.

claim had Jesus to assert His view against the universally esteemed guardians of tradition, and the learned and acknowledged expounders of the law? He could indeed only do so if able to appeal to a higher authority; and in this case that was just what He had done. Even the remarks given in the oldest source as those by which He justified His Sabbath observance, close with the declaration that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8). After all that we have heard, it is certainly inconceivable (comp. Book III. chaps. x. and xi.) that He wished thereby to abrogate the Sabbath, or to dispense with its recognition. This is contrary even to the tenor of His words; for only if the Sabbath were a sacred, inviolable institution could there be a unique pre-eminence in being its master. But the remark does not refer to anything of the kind: the Son of man is manifestly that unique One, coming to bring the promised consummation of the theocracy; who is therefore placed above all theocratic institutions, not of course to abrogate them, but, in conformity with the will of the heavenly King of the theocracy, to arrange in what way these institutions are to be used, and the regulations and commands obeyed.[1] This therefore is the Messianic authority in virtue of which Jesus claimed to practise and teach the Sabbath observance which alone corresponds with the will of the Lawgiver.

There is a reminiscence in all our sources that the momentous conflict between Jesus and those who were regarded as the authoritative teachers took its rise in regard to this question. What gave the greatest offence, however, was the fact that Jesus' ministry of healing was in no way restricted upon that day. It was always regarded as a prohibited thing to

[1] Even Mark has suggested no other meaning, though he connects this statement with Jesus' justification of the observance of the Sabbath, which he alone has preserved (Mark ii. 27 f.). It is a totally modern misconception so to apprehend this connection as if Jesus had thereby attributed to man as such, or even to the archetypal man only, the right to rule over the Sabbath. Because the Sabbath was instituted for the good of humanity, the Messiah therefore, whose specific calling it is to bring about the salvation of His people, has also control over this subsidiary institution. As the slight modification of the expression shows, this connection is certainly not the original one, it emphasizes another side of the Messianic calling; but it, too, had the same object in view—to vindicate the Messiah's right to exercise and teach the proper fulfilment of the Sabbath law.

cure even on the Sabbath on account of the necessary treatment, and the same rule was observed when all that was needed was a simple word of command or exorcism. It was a subject of dispute between the different schools of scribes whether consolations might be offered on that day. Thus it was that Jesus' cures of the sick made Him constantly appear like a Sabbath-breaker; and the manner in which by His apologies He repeatedly caused His opponents to take refuge in an abashed silence would certainly not help to remove the offence, but would only embitter the dispute. It was probably in connection with those remarks as to the observance of the Sabbath, which reach their height in Matt. xii. 8, that the oldest source introduced a narrative of the same character (Luke xiv. 2–6).[1] It simply begins by telling how Jesus caught sight of a man suffering from dropsy, and inquired of the lawyers and Pharisees whether it was permissible to heal on the Sabbath. We see therefore that this question was already a matter of controversy between them; and their silence shows that they knew from experience how Jesus could disarm the current objections to His observance with a ready word to which they could not reply. Taking their silence as acquiescence, Jesus at once proceeds to cure the sick man, which in this case also was effected by a touch. When that is done, however, He goes on to justify the action, but He does not purposely choose the case of a son or an ox falling into a well, as is represented in Luke xiv. 5, for where life was in danger interference was allowed even by the strictest teachers of the law, and such a case was not here in question. He presents the case of a sheep falling into a pit on the Sabbath, and reminds them that the owner would never hesitate to lay hold of it and lift it out in order to preserve it from further injury (Matt. xii. 11). The scribes might dispute *ad libitum* as to whether the later Talmud tradition granted this permission or refused it. If, as Jesus emphasizes,

[1] This source paid little attention to the historical details, but much to the words of Jesus, so that it probably contained nothing more particular as to the situation of this occurrence. Luke has transferred it to a feast in the house of a Pharisee, and has probably inserted the feature of the ambuscade of the Pharisees (xiv. 1) from Mark iii. 2. The first evangelist has plainly preserved Jesus' decisive words in their original form, interweaving them with the cure on the Sabbath, which he takes from Mark (Matt. xii. 11 f.)

the sheep was the man's only one, his self-interest would at least tell him what to do even if his natural feelings did not, and in such a case practice never consulted any casuistry of the law. But Jesus made them observe the greater value of a man than a sheep (Matt. xii. 12), and thereby contested His right to do for the sick man what should preserve him from further affliction. His opponents could answer nothing to this; but His superiority in matters of the law could only deepen the animosity felt towards Him by those men so proud of their juridical learning.

In the source from which Luke drew there was such another case (Luke xiii. 10–17). In one of the synagogues in which Jesus taught a woman was present who had for eighteen years suffered from paralysis of the muscles, and now, bent and probably leaning on crutches, crept about unable to lift herself up. Whenever Jesus saw her, He called her to Him, and announced deliverance from her infirmity. He distinctly described it as having already taken place, and therefore the real cause of the malady must have been removed by a divine miracle; the laying on of the hand however, was not superfluous on that account. It was only as a result of this that the woman acquired ability and heart to make any exertion herself; she stood up and glorified God for her recovery. There is something highly characteristic in the way in which the ruler of the synagogue hesitated about connecting himself with this man of the people, and turned to the multitude with an exhortation founded upon the law (Deut. v. 13). There are six days, he said, in which men ought to work; in them, therefore, come and be healed, but not on the day of the Sabbath. It was of course intended that Jesus should take this indirect reproof home to Himself; but He chid the ruler by reminding him how no one hesitated on that day to loose his ox or ass from the manger and lead it away to the watering, for that was an action expressly permitted by the Talmud itself. Jesus then compared His cure with the act which was acknowledged to be permissible. He too had released one of God's creatures from its bonds; it was not an animal, however, but a daughter of Abraham, who as one of the chosen people had a far greater claim to such a benefit. He had undoubtedly performed it on the Sabbath,

but then it was much more pressing than the leading of an animal to drink; for Satan had already held her bound for eighteen years. It is certainly true that, in order to the cure being regarded as the loosening of a bond, this daughter of Abraham must have been a sinner if Jesus could describe her crookedness as a binding by Satan; but Jesus probably did so because He knew that the woman's malady was the result of her sinful life, and therefore that Satan, who tempted her to sin, was the ultimate cause of it.[1] Once more His adversaries were utterly confounded, and Jesus had the jubilations of the multitude all upon His side.

The conflict shows itself considerably advanced in Mark's narrative of another cure on the Sabbath (iii. 1–5). He tells how, on entering on one occasion into a synagogue, Jesus found a man with a withered hand, which he was unable to move, because the circulation of blood had ceased. This time, however, the Pharisees watched particularly if He would heal upon the Sabbath day, so that they might bring a formal complaint against Him on account of His infringement of the law; the traditionary exposition of the law only permitted the healing of a diseased member on the Sabbath when there would be danger in delay, and this was evidently not the case on this occasion. Jesus saw their intention; and in order to show, in contrast to their malicious proceeding, how His action had no fear of meeting the utmost publicity, He bade the sick man come into the midst, and Himself seized the initiative in discussing the Sabbath question. Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good or to do harm? to save a life or to kill?—was what He asked. By including healing in the category of good actions, and then contrasting this with evil, He made the decision in His favour inevitable. For a morally good action,

[1] It is plainly these words of Jesus which caused Luke to refer the woman's disease to possession by an evil spirit whose speciality it was to produce nervous complaints (xiii. 11; comp. p. 78, note). This is distinctly contradicted by what Jesus says in ver. 12, and by the manner of the cure (ver. 13); the laying on of the hand never occurs in a case of expulsion of demons, nor would its purpose there be easy to understand; and besides, expulsions of demons are not cures (ver. 14). It is not probable that Jesus characterized His opponents as hypocrites (ver. 15). It may well be that the zeal for the law displayed by the ruler of the synagogue was hypocritical, because only done in order that Jesus might be denounced to the people as an infringer of the law; but it was not till later that Jesus pronounced the condemnation of His adversaries.

the omission of which would be a sin, can never be doubtful; its omission cannot be a duty under any circumstances. In order to make this still clearer, He represented the cure under the parallel alternative of saving life or destroying it. It was admitted, even by the traditionary exposition, that danger of life justified the infringement of the Sabbatic law; but Jesus desired to draw attention to the fact that healing, whenever it can be accomplished, is just as much an unconditioned ethical duty as the saving of life, and its omission as much a sin as killing, and that it is indifferent for the ethical view whether it may possibly result in danger to life or not. Ethical duty, in its absoluteness, is here assuredly placed on a higher platform than obedience to theocratic rules of life; but in the subordination of the latter Jesus perceived the divine method of fulfilling it. Since it was from this standpoint that He presented His alternative, His opponents could not pronounce against the healing upon the Sabbath without placing themselves in diametrical opposition to the public conscience, and that was why they wrapped themselves in the cloak of silence. Looking round Him, Jesus regards them each particularly, to see if no one will so far conquer his prejudice as to give honour to the truth; and His anger rises when all remain obstinately silent. Wrath, however, is soon changed into compassion, when He perceives, from the uniformity of their sentiments, that what seemed a judgment of obduracy had come over them; and now, careless of their acquiescence, He performs the deed He has been justifying. He bids the man stretch forth his hand, just as He commanded the paralytic to arise, because He knows that through God's miraculous power the paralysis has lost its force; the man stretched it forth, and his hand was restored.[1]

[1] Strauss saw in this a manifestly fabulous imitation of an Old Testament narrative which tells how the hand of King Jeroboam, which he stretched forth against the man of God, withered, and was restored in answer to his prayer (1 Kings xiii. 4–6). Volkmar regarded it as an allegory of releasing the hand bound by the Sabbatic law for usual employments. That is at least more consistent than the action of the old and new Rationalism, in so reducing the complaint that it could be removed by a simple psychological exercise of power brought to bear upon the patient's power of muscle and of will,—a proceeding which is opposed to the whole sense of the evangelical narrative. The first evangelist blended this story with the cure on the Sabbath, given in the oldest source. Although it is manifestly much more improbable, he not only represents the

Jesus had therefore become in the eyes of the Pharisees an outrager of the law who was worthy of death, for that was the punishment for Sabbath desecration (Ex. xxxi. 15); He had not only claimed the right of profaning the day by His cures, but had also compromised the guardians of the law in the eyes of the people by condemning them to shamefaced silence. Henceforward the hatred of the Pharisaic party to Him was deadly; it was resolved that He should die. It must not be overlooked, however, that as a party the Pharisees refrained from employing any means of satisfying such a wish, although nourished daily with an ever-increasing hatred. The question concerning the Sabbath, which both theoretically and practically was so variously apprehended, offered little prospect for incrimination before the Sanhedrim, particularly as this court, although greatly under Pharisaic influence, showed little interest in questions of law which had no bearing upon the interests of the priesthood. And there was no longer such a thing as a puritanism which would pronounce sentence of death for desecration of the Sabbath according to the letter of the old law.[1] As regards this point, therefore, there was nothing left for the Pharisees but to observe Jesus closely, to demonstrate fresh cases of flagrant Sabbath profanation, and particularly to find out other breaches of the law, and if necessary to provoke Him to statements which would present the requisite material for a formal complaint.

Under these circumstances, which assuredly offered little prospect for what they had in view, it is very probable that this party sought for allies in their conflict with Jesus; in

adversaries as lying in wait for Jesus, but as immediately propounding the Sabbath question in a form which shows traces of Luke xiv. 3, and which Jesus answers with a statement taken from that narrative; and not only so, but He also deduces a conclusion from it in which there are still more distinct suggestions of Mark (Matt. xii. 10–12), which takes no account of the silence of His opponents and the impression which this made upon Jesus. But on this account to regard both narratives as variations of the same tradition is quite arbitrary.

[1] But even if the Pharisaic party could have succeeded in carrying away the Council, it was necessary to obtain sanction for their decisions from the by no means always compliant procurator. It is true that the dispute regarding the Sabbath was what brought about the breach between Jesus and the hierarchy, but we shall see how in Jerusalem it concerned a totally different side of the whole question; comp. Book IV. chap. ix.

Galilee such were found in the Herodians, *i.e.* the partisans of Herod's sons, who still held the sceptre in the northern province. It is true that the party holding in principle the theocratic ideal must have been inimically disposed to these adherents of Roman vassaldom; but party politics may for once have risen above this question as to principles when the end in view was the removal of a dangerous foe. There would be no difficulty in representing to this party that the Messianic movement which brought Jesus into notice might ultimately endanger the throne of the princes as well as the dominion of the Pharisaic faction. Mark expressly narrates how they devised plans with the Herodians by which Jesus could be removed (iii. 6); it was probably intended that the latter should induce the tetrarch's court to proceed against this dangerous man. They would recollect how the gaoler at the fortress of Machærus could tell how another troublesome preacher had not long before been silenced. There are doubtless good reasons for the almost total disappearance of the Herodians from the evangelical history, and for the fact that our Gospels make no mention of success attending their machinations. The conscience of the prince was already sufficiently burdened by the murder of the favourite prophet of the people. The people long afterwards regarded the unhappy war with Aretas as a divine punishment for this crime against a just man, and the tetrarch must even then have endured retribution in the pangs of his own conscience, for he had become John's murderer in spite of his better knowledge, and notwithstanding the whisperings of his conscience. Mark certainly says that Jesus attracted attention at Court only in consequence of the Baptist's mission (vi. 14); but it is difficult to believe that report of Him had not penetrated earlier to the capital lying so near His sphere of operations. If the Court party actually formed a close alliance with the Pharisees, they would undoubtedly be anxious to draw attention to the new prophet. But in whatever way the tetrarch heard of Jesus and His wondrous deeds, we learn distinctly that the impression made upon him was of uneasy fear. He believed, it is true, as little in a bodily return of Elias as in the sending of a true prophet; but the superstitious idea which was popularly believed in, that John the Baptist had risen from

the dead, roused the uneasy conscience of the prince like a peal of thunder (Mark vi. 16). From him truly Jesus had nothing to fear, for no one regarded Him with more superstitious terror than the ruler of His country.[1]

But even if either the Sanhedrim or the tetrarch could be induced to enter on a process against Jesus, it was not to be supposed that any one would venture to touch this popular man so long as the favour of the people lasted. This fact drew to it the particular attention of the Pharisaic party; for under any circumstances the most important thing to be aimed at was to undermine His position with the people, to do everything to discredit Him with them, and so to rouse their mistrust. To this end, therefore, their next endeavours were directed.

[1] Luke was the first who refused to credit him with receiving such a superstitious idea, and assumed that it was mere curiosity that agitated him on hearing of Jesus (Luke ix. 9).

## CHAPTER V.

### A FRESH FOE.

SIGNS are not awanting that the ministry of Jesus did, even in circles which were not yet ripe for the deepest comprehension of it, create a powerful spiritual excitement. On one occasion there came to Him a rich man, who was able to look back upon a life which was outwardly blameless; and he asked Him, while testifying the deepest reverence, what he must do in order to make sure of participating in the completed salvation (Mark x. 17). He manifestly belonged to the number of those who had a certain misgiving that the righteousness which Jesus demanded and strove to realize in the kingdom of God was quite different from that which the doctors of the law taught and the Pharisees practised; but, biassed by the conceptions which through them had become prevalent, this man was unable to imagine anything else than that Jesus would demand something far transcending the requirements of the law, and would make its accomplishment the condition of participating in the kingdom of God. It has been thought surprising that he addressed Jesus as "Good Master," for among the Jews this was not a customary title given to teachers; but the whole bearing of the man, who even goes so far as to kneel to Jesus, shows that he felt himself to be in the presence of one greater than a scribe, and that he regarded Jesus as at least a divinely-commissioned teacher, who by realizing in Himself the ideal of good, could also show others how they might participate in the consummation of salvation in the kingdom of God. The reason why Jesus refused this title in all seriousness was because none is good save one, even God (Mark x. 18). For so long as man is engaged in the battle of life, his task is always to *be* good; new temptations are continually presenting themselves which he has to overcome, and fresh problems are ever being pro-

pounded for him to solve. This does not preclude the possibility that in isolated cases man may have solved these problems, and may do so again (comp. vol. i. p. 351); but before he has reached the goal of perfection, he certainly dare not call himself good, or allow himself to be so termed; to imagine that the ideal has already been realized would soon result in the slackening of continuous realization, and man's attainment of the goal would thereby be greatly endangered.[1]

It was at this point that Jesus simply referred the questioner to the statutes of the divine law he was already well acquainted with (x. 19). He enumerates the commands of the Decalogue, which prohibit any injury to our neighbour as regards his life, conjugal relations, property or honour (Ex. xx. 13–16), and adds a short compendium of the ninth and tenth commandments (Ex. xx. 17), which remind one of other injunctions (Ex. xxi. 10; Deut. xxiv. 14), placing alongside these prohibitions, however, a positive command inculcating duty towards parents (Ex. xx. 12). The first evangelist thought himself obliged to add the command to love (Matt. xix. 19). But Jesus did not choose the first three commandments referring to duty towards God, because the question showed that the man was not lacking in earnest piety, but was anxious to know how that could be manifested in duty towards his neighbour; He therefore confined Himself intentionally to the fundamental commands of the Decalogue, and did not mention the all-embracing duty of love, precisely because He desired to show the questioner how much he lacked in readiness to fulfil the whole law. For in respect to all that was first said he believed himself able to answer with a good conscience, that from youth up he had refrained from doing what the Decalogue forbade (Mark x. 20). There

[1] Although the designation of the good to which the petitioner desires to attain as "eternal life" probably belongs to later apostolic language, yet he plainly desired to obtain participation in the kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. The usual subterfuge is quite untenable, which holds that Jesus only refused the title "Good Master" in order to make the questioner observe that he had not pondered its full signification, or because the man regarded Jesus as nothing more than a human teacher. Even the first evangelist had no difficulty in regard to this declinature, for his apprehension of Jesus' answer equally attributes complete goodness to God alone; not until the rich man asked for the highest good, was it pointed out to him that simple goodness was contained in the law (Matt. xix. 16 f.).

was no proud self-righteousness in this, for had it been otherwise Mark would scarcely say that Jesus, looking upon him, loved him; in truth, the questioner did not once suppose that he had been perfectly innocent in regard to all those matters, but only that he had ever striven to be so. It was indeed because, in spite of all his anxiety to satisfy the law, he still considered himself unworthy of God's good pleasure that he made inquiries concerning a particular fulfilment which should secure that assuredly, and was not satisfied by being referred to the ten commandments.[1]

Jesus read the man's honesty in his countenance; He therefore mentioned one thing which would really test whether he was not lacking in one fundamental disposition upon which Jesus knew all divine good pleasure was dependent. If he meant to acknowledge Jesus to be a master pointing out the path to the goal, and if he was really in earnest in his endeavours to find it, he would also be prepared at Jesus' call to join His permanent escort, even if that required the sacrifice of everything (comp. Matt. xiii. 45 f.). It was nothing less than this that Jesus asked of him; for to be a genuine disciple he must be ready to deny himself everything which hitherto has engaged his interest and his heart; he is to alienate his possessions and give everything to the poor, if he would really gain God's good pleasure, and so acquire a treasure in heaven (Mark x. 21). The claim which Jesus now made was by no means one always presented to His disciples, nor even to His constant companions; the reason for it in this case was probably because Jesus wished to give an opportunity to the questioner for serious self-examination as to whether his readiness was truly without reserve; he had declared, indeed, that his only

[1] It was the latter evangelist who first apprehended his words as if he supposed himself to have positively fulfilled all the commandments (Luke xviii. 21); indeed, the first evangelist represents him as asking directly what he yet lacked. It is this evangelist who is most generally followed by expounders, and he describes the questioner as being a young man (Matt. xix. 20) because Jesus expounds filial duty to him, a duty, however, which does not cease for a man so long as his parents live. But he cannot possibly have been a youth, for it is said that he could look back upon a youthful life free from reproach, and that he believed himself to be clear of the sins of murder, fornication, stealing, and false witness. Luke describes him as the ruler of a synagogue, or even as member of the Council (Luke xviii. 18); but that was probably an inference from his wealth.

desire was to be made aware of the highest requirement, because convinced that he was equally ready to fulfil that as he believed he had been prepared to fulfil the commandments already known to him. Jesus desired to secure this simple-minded heart for Himself, and to take him into the most intimate band of His disciples; but only if he stood this test.[1] This the rich man did not do; he called in mind his fair possessions, his countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful (x. 22).

Among modern critics Renan especially dearly likes to represent Jesus as a true Ebionite, who pronounced poverty to be the true evangelical position, and the poor to be those who shall alone be blessed. He sees in it just such traces of communism as the words of the Gospel are often made to yield. It can hardly be denied that Luke manifests an ascetic view of life, seeing something sinful in wealth *qua* wealth (comp. vi. 24 f.), and therefore regarding the renunciation of the same and the disposal of it in alms as the only way by which to be purified from it (xi. 41, xii. 33).[2] Jesus never gives countenance to such an idea. But as He saw the rich man going sadly away, whom He had longed to secure for a disciple, He sorrowfully declared how difficult it was for those possessing earthly goods to enter the kingdom (Mark

[1] It is generally overlooked that this requirement shows unmistakeably that the incident took place at a time when the number of the twelve apostles was not yet complete. Mark appears to place it during the period of Jesus' last journeys, thereby showing distinctly that in this section he has arranged a series of didactic narratives, without having regard to their date, but purely according to the subjects to which they refer. The first and third evangelists simply copied him; indeed, their representation is seen to be a mere redaction of the text of Mark.

[2] Luke accordingly regards Jesus' summons to the rich man as one of general application, although this was by no means involved in the original form of the remark (Matt. xxiii. 26, vi. 19 f.); indeed, Jesus cannot have required His disciples to sell all their private possessions and employ the proceeds in almsgiving, when He was occasionally in the habit of inviting Himself to their houses. Although Luke imagined apparently that this principle was carried out in the primitive Church (Acts ii. 45, iv. 34 f.), yet facts which he has incorporated from his sources (iv. 37, v. 4) prove that this was not the case. It is unnecessary so to apprehend the words used by the first evangelist (Matt. xix. 21) as if he regarded voluntary poverty as a higher grade of superlegal perfection, for the ethical ideal differs to each individual, and corresponds indeed to the concrete demands of God, which present themselves in the varied positions and experiences of life.

x. 23). All experience teaches what power wealth has over the human heart, and how it impedes its progress towards a higher religio-ethical goal. Riches was the enemy from which Jesus was unable to rescue this human heart. To the disciples, who had been greatly surprised at His words, He was obliged to amplify His statement; not only was it difficult, but humanly speaking it was impossible, for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. As Jesus put it drastically, "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye." But He also reminded His amazed disciples, who deduced the logical conclusion that no rich man could be saved, that this was impossible with men, but not with God, "for all things are possible with Him" (x. 24–27). It was impossible for this rich man, for he had desired to secure salvation by his own power; and the test to which Jesus put him was necessary to make him conscious of his impotence. But while thus destroying all self-righteous confidence, Jesus pointed to the gracious assistance of God in sending Him who through His ministry could loosen every bond from those who truly believe.

In Luke's special source this question was treated of in a section which in many ways forms a supplement to the story of the rich man. It gives a parabolic narrative which Jesus addressed to those who were avaricious, and yet who passed as honest both to themselves and others. They were held in high repute of men, but because of their attachment to earthly goods were abominable in the sight of the Searcher of hearts (Luke xvi. 14 f.).[1] The parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19–31) is another illustration of the dangers of riches. It is incomprehensible how any one can hesitate as to whether this parable presents a unity, or whether the second portion may not be a later addition; for no didactic lessons whatever can be drawn from the first half. The rich man, dressing magnificently and passing his days in luxury, is only a type of a worldly-minded man who lives as his wealth enables

[1] This address put Luke in mind of the Pharisees, and he assumed that Jesus related the parable because they scorned His warnings against the worship of mammon. For this, however, there was no occasion, for the parable exhibits no anti-Pharisaic polemic, and the characteristics of those who, notwithstanding outward honesty, are entirely given up to the worship of wealth, and, indeed, owe to it their honourable position among men, do not refer exactly to the Pharisees.

and tempts him to do. No particular sin is laid to his charge, nor is mention made of his lack of sympathy with the miserable wretch before his door. The latter is only mentioned in the parable in order to make what is said of the rich man more prominent by contrast, and there is therefore no special reproach directed to him for not granting the beggar the scraps from the table which he craved to satisfy his hunger; and the fact of the dogs, which do the same (Matt. xv. 27), treating the man as one of themselves, is only intended to represent the beggar's miserable condition; and yet the rich man did not grudge him the place before the door, although he was certainly no pleasant object for the owner and his guests to behold. That death reversed their position is certainly not the teaching of the parable; in that case it would be nothing but an illustrative narrative intended to lay stress on the fact that the rich man went to the place of torment, while in truth it seems to be only taken for granted (xvi. 23). If, humanly speaking, it is impossible for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God, it is only a matter of course that he goes to hell instead.[1] The didactic purpose of the parable is only seen when Dives complains of his sufferings to Abraham, and beseeches that his thirst may be assuaged; this is represented as being absolutely impossible, since the close of earthly existence decides human destiny irrevocably in conformity with the divine principle of requital, as that is shown in the impassable gulf separating the blessed from the guilty (xvi. 26). When the good things enjoyed by the rich man during his earthly life are described as *his* good things, it is manifestly involved in this that he was unacquainted with any higher possessions, and that this was what had brought him to his present condition.[2] Nevertheless, however, this is hinted at

[1] It is equally impossible that the intention of the parable is to teach us anything regarding matters in the other world. The material for the narrative is simply taken from the contemporaneous notions as to the condition of things in Sheol, which, however certainly they rest upon a profound spiritual truth, are yet sensuously apprehended and depicted. It is represented that in the realm of the dead there are two distinct localities divided by an insurmountable chasm; when the poor man has been borne of angels to the one (Luke xxiii. 43), he rests in the greatest felicity on the bosom of the patriarch Abraham; in the other, the rich man is tormented by the flames of fire, and is in anguish from burning thirst.

[2] It may be that the expression which might mean here that the rich man was tormented because he was rich, and the poor man was refreshed because he

much too indirectly for it to be regarded as the teaching of the parable, particularly as Dives never once disputed the justice of his fate, and therefore there was no need for justifying it. It is rather the presupposition of the narrative, and its teaching must be that if, on the ground of this assumption, a man's lot is reversed, and his bliss is changed into torment, when death separates him from all temporal possessions—the change is irrevocable.

But even this truth, which is notorious even if often overlooked, cannot be the only teaching of the parable, but is merely preparative for what is presented in the closing portion. It is perfectly manifest there that the rich man is quite conscious of having deserved his lot, and knows how different it might have been with him; he is well aware that, instead of finding all his happiness in wealth and the pleasures afforded by it, he should have striven for higher possessions. This, indeed, is the reason why he asks that a message be sent to his five brothers, declaring what a fate will be theirs if they live as he has done, indulging in worldly dispositions, and refusing to repent. It is here we first meet with the real theme of the narrative. For, after it is pointed out that his brethren have Moses and the prophets to lead them to repentance, and he has nevertheless expressed the hope that they will pay more attention to one who has risen from the dead, he is informed that if they do not listen to those, neither will they be persuaded by the other means (Luke xvi. 27–31). This can only be meant to prove that the rich man was ruined irremediably because he had not been moved to renounce his worldly life by the divine revelation to which he had access; and therefore that the rich men to whom Jesus spoke were called on to be persuaded by the divine revelation they received through His proclamation, and that they needed to be completely changed if they were not to be overtaken by irrevocable destruction. For there is just as little reason to expect that something strange will happen to

was poor, has some dependence upon Luke, who was not far from thinking that wealth was sinful in itself, and that poverty was possessed of some meritoriousness. In truth, however, it follows even in regard to this point, that the poor man is only introduced here for the sake of contrast, and therefore that the question of his ultimate blessedness was never raised; the virtues attributed to him by expounders far transcend what the text presents.

startle them out of their security, as that an alleviation or alteration of their lot can be hoped for if they continue in their worldly life until death overtakes them.[1]

This parable therefore points with terrible earnestness to the dangers of wealth, but it shows at the same time how they may be avoided. It is not said that the way to do so is to renounce wealth, but it lies in the change of heart, which, according to the correct interpretation of the parable, must show itself in refraining from seeking in riches the highest good, and in not being induced by love of wealth to pass this temporal life in worldly luxuriousness instead of striving after higher possessions. But Jesus did not rest satisfied with giving this purely negative command, and what follows shows clearly how far He was from entertaining any merely ascetic view of the world. Riches can and ought to be used in the service of God. The kingdom of God was not regarded by Jesus as being a purely religious community, but as the

[1] The parable would clearly be nothing more than an illustrative narrative if it actually taught that Moses and the prophets, *i.e.* the Old Testament revelation of God's will, sufficed to lead men to a change of heart, and therefore to a renunciation of the worldly disposition so easily produced by riches, and also that people should not wait for that until miracles take place, or even until a message comes from beyond the grave. Its teaching would in that case be very striking, for Jesus judged the Old Testament preaching of repentance to be by no means sufficient; and He not only performed miracles in order to support His own preaching of repentance (Matt. xi. 20), but even supported by His resurrection the preaching of His disciples (Acts v. 31), although not, of course, by bringing tidings from beyond the grave. Luke, nevertheless, apprehended the parable as an illustrative narrative, and therefore deduced the teaching from it that the law and the prophets retained even in the Messianic epoch the permanent significance of bringing the worldly-minded to repentance, thus preparing the way for the salvation the gospel proclaimed. In this sense he believed he could discover in the parable the true explanation of Jesus at one time saying that the gospel relaxed the obligation to observe the law and the prophets (Matt. xi. 12 f.), at another that not a jot or tittle of the law should fail (Matt. v. 18); as bearing on this he gives an allegorical interpretation to Matt. v. 32, showing that none dare separate himself from God's ancient ordinances for the sake of the new, although he may not continue the old connection when once it has been dissolved by God Himself (Luke xvi. 16-18). On this account also he has sought to discover a direct application for the concluding assertions, and found it in this—that the Lazarus who was actually aroused from the dead (John xi.) did not rouse the Pharisees to repentance. It is probably in consequence of this exposition that he names the poor man in the parable Lazarus, for that is contrary to Jesus' general habit of leaving the figures in His parables nameless.

religious consummation of national existence, in which each section would place its circumstances and possessions at the service of God, to be ordered and employed according to His will, so that even riches should be used in conformity with its original purpose; it therefore follows self-evidently that there is nothing sinful in wealth itself, and that there must be such a thing as a use of it, which is not sinful either. This aspect of the question was exhibited even in the oldest source by means of two parables which doubtless originally formed a parable-pair, and were so related by Jesus to His followers. The parable of the unjust steward shows first of all (Luke xvi. 1–8) how true wisdom in the employment of wealth is that which does not use it in the pleasures of the moment, but for a higher purpose—to gain by means of it divine satisfaction, and so ensure future welfare. The steward in the parable is placed in such a position that he is compelled to consider how his prospects may be assured. It has just been discovered that he is in the habit of dishonestly making away with his master's property, and is called upon to give an account of his stewardship; dismissal is all he can look forward to. He is represented as reflecting what is to become of him in the future; he has not learned to work like a day-labourer, and is ashamed to beg. Taking advantage, therefore, of the time during which he will still have control over his master's goods, he does not enjoy a short period of splendid existence, but he busies himself with deceptively falsifying the bonds of some of his master's debtors, thereby laying them under an obligation to himself, and thus securing their friendship and support for the days to come. At the close of the parable, the lord, who is rich enough to bear the loss without any inconvenience, is represented as commending the cleverness of the unjust steward; this is done that the true lesson of the parable may be pointed out.[1] It is

[1] The endless difficulties in which the interpretation of this parable is involved plainly result from disregard of this hint. There is a general inclination to interpret it allegorically, although there is far from being a consensus of opinion as to whether the rich householder signifies God or the devil, the Romans or the theocratic heads of the people, mammon or something else. Jesus' utterances in parables were, however, never so undidactic that their explanation was an insoluble enigma. The rich man has as little significance as any single figure in the parable; it is the general truth yielded by the whole to which we are to

therefore intended to represent by a picture from common life in what true wisdom in the use of wealth consists. Indeed, Jesus expressly mentioned at the conclusion why He had chosen the material for the parable from a sphere where dishonesty was triumphant, and therefore prudence was conjoined with falsity and deceit (comp. Matt. x. 16). The children of this world, in which sin and dishonesty reign, excel in wisdom when dealing with such as themselves. They never hesitate about the means to be employed, and in intercourse with their own kind can calculate what methods will succeed, even although carried out deceitfully, and they also know most certainly how to find the means which will serve their ends. The children of light, who in regard to these matters often act with great imprudence, may learn from them how to employ wealth discreetly. It is self-evident that they will exercise this wisdom in quite another way, for their circumstances are totally different; but the principle remains the same—that wealth be employed so as to secure the future which depends on God's satisfaction. He who does not use his temporal goods, looking the while at the perfected consummation of the kingdom of God, withdraws them from aiding in this endeavour, and so hinders the attainment of that end.[1]

The presupposition of the parable is clearly this, that even temporal goods are entrusted to man by God, and that therefore there is such an employment of them as corresponds to His intention, because it serves the purpose for which He bestowed them. This God-pleasing use of riches, therefore, is nothing else than a true stewardship of entrusted goods, and

have any regard. When objection is taken to Jesus employing didactically what is blameworthy in itself, that is to confound the parable with an example intended to teach what is to be done in similar circumstances.

[1] At the close of the parable Luke recommends in figurative form the employment of wealth in acts of beneficence (xvi. 9). This application cannot be strictly deduced from the narrative, and it is quite inadmissible so to narrow the teaching which is given there. In this way, however, an allegorizing interpretation of the parable can easily be arrived at, although it is impossible to carry it out fully, for the deceptive advantage granted by the steward in his own interest to his master's debtors cannot in any way be regarded as a benefit shown to them. The witness borne by the receivers of alms can very incorrectly be regarded as corresponding to admission into heaven, and in this relatively early period of Jesus' ministry there could be little reference to the participation in the heavenly consummation alluded to in His authentic speeches.

it was from this point of view that Jesus represented the right use of it in the second portion of this parable pair, which treated of the talents (Matt. xxv. 14–28). In this a householder, whose business involved considerable money transactions, having occasion to travel, entrusted his capital to his household servants, but at the same time took into account the greater or less capacity of each individual for conducting business. On his return home he found that two slaves, to whom he had entrusted five and two talents respectively, had by zealous trading doubled the amount, enabling him to promise them an increase in authority.[1] On the other hand, one of the servants to whom he had not entrusted so much, having given him only one talent, had idly buried the same, and tried to excuse himself by saying that he was afraid to risk it, knowing as he did his master's severity of character; he regarded himself as sufficiently justified when he handed his master back the talent uninjured. But the lord reprimanded the idle servant, proving from his own words that the severity of his master ought to have had the effect of making him still more dutiful, and pointing out how, without any great trouble, he might have employed the capital entrusted to him by giving it to the bankers. That talent is therefore taken from him and is used in fulfilling the promise made to the other servants. The true interpretation of this incident is pointed out by Jesus Himself in an apothegm which proceeds upon a rule taught by experience, that it is

[1] In the parable the journey of the householder is only a natural occasion for testing the servants, but the allegorizing interpretation made it refer to Christ's leaving the earth and His return to judge. This is why the first evangelist places this parable among those bearing on the second coming, while Luke discovers in it his own doctrinal tendency, that Jesus will not establish the kingdom at once, but will first quit the earth in order to be invested by God with Messianic sovereignty; he therefore represents the parable as being uttered while on the last journey to Jerusalem (Luke xix. 11). In his account the plain man of business becomes a magnate who, like the Herods with their pilgrimages to Rome, goes abroad to receive his kingly title, and rewards his faithful servants with authority over a number of cities (Luke xix. 12, xvii. 19). Ultimately, however, this allegorizing application exceeds the bounds of the parabolic figure, for the unbelieving Jews who will not acknowledge Christ's kingship, and therefore fall victims to the judgment, appear all of a sudden along with the servants of the parable as co-citizens with the nobleman; they had sent an embassy to protest against his elevation to regal authority, and are on that account slain as high traitors by the king on his triumphant return (xix. 14, 27).

an easy matter for the rich to make more wealth, while the little that the poor have is soon consumed (Matt. xxv. 29 Luke xix. 26). It follows from this, therefore, that he who, in agreement with the will of God, has increased the goods entrusted to him, whether they be much or little, will receive a further increase because he has proved himself qualified for God's service; while he who is unfaithful in the stewardship of temporal goods is punished even by the loss of them, in so far as any use of wealth which is not in agreement with the will of God will end in its being spent in a way which secures no lofty advantage. Temporal possessions, then, are also serviceable in forwarding the kingdom of God, and only he who uses them for this purpose will obtain any augmentation.[1]

It is clear that in the oldest source this parable was conjoined with that of the unjust steward, for some sentences are still preserved in Luke which must have been connected with the former (Luke xvi. 10–13). Whether one be entrusted with much or little of this world's goods, it is certainly little in comparison with the more valuable possessions of the kingdom of God. But that is the very reason why their employment is a test of fidelity, and therefore of capacity for managing great possessions; and it is now evident that even in the parable of the talents, the increase of possessions through faithful stewardship, as well as through the reward of the same, by no means consists merely in being endowed with greater riches, but in the attainment of a higher purpose, and

[1] Our evangelists have striven in different ways to give this closing apothegm a spiritual interpretation (Mark iv. 25; Matt. xiii. 12). When once the Lord was supposed to mean Christ on His second coming, it was a probable sequence that His judgment referred to the good or bad use made of spiritual endowments, and that the faithful would be rewarded by being allowed to enter into the joy of their Lord, while the faithless would be punished by being thrust into outer darkness (Matt. xxv. 21, xxiii. 30), although the parable itself, alongside of the closing apothegm and in conformity with it, represents quite a different retribution as having taken place (vv. 21, 23, 28 f.). Luke represents the whole of the ten servants—although afterwards we only meet with the three servants of the original parable—as having a pound (mina) distributed among them, *i.e.* the gospel itself (Luke xix. 13), whose faithful proclamation has been attended with varied success (xix. 16, 18). This edifying application, however, far exceeds the sense of the parable, which simply treats of the faithful employment of entrusted wealth.

in being entrusted with greater tasks. Fidelity is here contrasted with dishonesty, and it is manifest therefore that true wisdom consists in the faithful disposal of temporal possessions in conformity with the divine will; but so that the dishonesty is excluded which goes hand in hand with wisdom in the world, from which the figure of the first parable was taken: "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much; and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much" (xvi. 10). From this Jesus drew the inference that if His followers were unfaithful in the employment of temporal possessions, which to a subject of the kingdom were unattractive, God could not entrust them with the higher possessions which belonged to them in that capacity (xvi. 12).[1] He is, however, far from lightly esteeming this world's goods, for He makes fidelity in their management the standard for testing capacity to undertake higher tasks. He regards temporal and spiritual possessions, as well as the tasks of earthly existence and of the kingdom of God, not as belonging to two distinct spheres, but as forming two separate sides of the one duty of discipleship, whose nature is genuine fidelity towards God, and unconditioned and therefore exclusive obedience to His will. For Jesus makes it clear by the close of the parable that true fidelity consists in that. "No servant can serve two masters." The truth of this proposition is evident, for the relationship of slave involves such an absolute power in the owner, that there can be no such thing as a division of services between two masters. But this relation, in which a man's entire person belongs to his master, demands more than service, it requires personal resignation, and the love which alone makes service of genuine value. The reverse side of this love,

[1] It is uncertain whether Jesus here described temporal riches as mammon or even as the mammon whose character is unfairness, for the expression, like that of the evangelist's addition in ver. 9, seems more suitable to Luke's view of wealth, although that appears to have some justification in the fact that wealth seems to lead to dishonesty with such facility. Chap. xvi. 11, however, where there is no true contrast between the faithfulness and the directly-named mammon, is certainly an elucidation by the evangelist, for Jesus would only characterize wealth as being relatively strange to them, because it belongs to this world and ceases with it, while the possessions of the kingdom of God are what belong to them specifically, and therefore permanently (ver. 12).

however, is hatred towards him who tries to estrange from the beloved master the service and obedience, yea, the minds and love, of his dependants. In the same degree in which any man cleaves to another with affection, will he despise those who desire service where they cannot demand love.

It is impossible to abate the austerity of this contrast, although it has been attempted again and again. It really means that the rules which are observed in the relationships of this life must be correctly applied to the corresponding higher relations. It is evident that God is a master to whom the whole man belongs, with his body and soul, his love and obedience. But in the case presented here another is opposed to Him, who likewise lays claim to the whole man. Daily experience teaches that the peculiarity of earthly wealth is to claim the entire man, to attract his undivided affection to itself, to absorb all his interests and demand his exclusive service. Wherever earthly possessions are not faithfully employed in the service of God, and where wealth is not prudently used to secure His good pleasure, and is made an object of endeavour for itself alone, there it becomes the idol, the deity, the enemy who disputes with God for the heart of man. It was this deity who bore the rich man to hell, who would not hear God's voice in Moses and the prophets, and who so influenced the rich man whom Jesus would fain have had for a disciple, that he turned away sorrowing. There can be no peace in this contest, and no mediation between the two parties; the heart of man cannot be divided between these two masters, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (xvi. 13).[1]

[1] It is in this saying that wealth is first described as an idol. It is therefore only anticipated in Luke xvi. 9–11, but this makes it clear that in Luke's source the parable of the unjust steward was in connection with this saying. The first evangelist introduced the remark about the service of mammon into the Sermon on the Mount in order to show that all accumulation of earthly treasures is nothing but service of mammon, although the beguiled heart dreams of dividing itself between that and God (Matt. vi. 24).

# CHAPTER VI.

## THE TWELVE.

POPULAR enthusiasm for Jesus was still upon the increase. Even the frequently recurring conflicts with the Pharisees had not abated it in any degree. It is a special characteristic of great masses of people, that at first they usually applaud a bold opposition to the authoritative powers, though it certainly does not follow that their leaning to the side of opposition will be permanent, or will even last until the decisive moment. Mark has preserved the reminiscence how, when these constantly recurring conflicts induced Jesus to avoid the unavailing disputations with the Pharisees,[1] the multitudes gathered round Him on the margin of the lake as they had never done before. He was now followed, not by Galilean crowds alone, but the people came from Judea and its capital, from the countries lying to the east of the Jordan as far as the Idumean territories in the south-east, as well as from the western frontiers which bounded Tyre and Sidon. It was undoubtedly the renown of the Great Physician which gathered those multitudes together, and probably the long distances to be traversed did not hinder them from bringing their sick to Him. On this occasion Jesus was completely surrounded by sufferers; and since it was impossible that all could speak to Him and explain their maladies, they were

[1] There is no foundation whatever in Mark iii. 7 for the often repeated attempts to adorn Jesus' Galilean activity with all manner of frightful pictures of murderous attempts and persecutions, "anxieties" and escapes. What has been said of the Pharisees' helplessness (comp. p. 241 f.) makes this perfectly impossible, and one cannot see why Jesus should have felt safer on the sea-shore than in Capernaum or some other town. Although the first evangelist is here confused with the escape from ambuscades, he has correctly shown by the reference to the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (Isa. xlii. 1-4) that Jesus desired at first to avoid any conflict (Matt. xii. 15-21; comp. particularly ver. 19).

satisfied if they succeeded in touching the garment of the great worker of miracles. The demoniacs, too, forced their way to Him, and He had constantly to guard against their invoking Him as the Messiah, and thereby giving the excitement of the people, which already ran so high, a direction that would be fatal to His ministry (Mark iii. 7–12). For it is undoubtedly correct to say of these motley crowds, that they had little idea of inferring any connection between Jesus' appearance and the promised epoch of salvation. The superstitious explanation seemed to them all-sufficient. Some said that the murdered prophet had risen to life, and now laboured, fully equipped with the miraculous powers of another world; others saw in Jesus the great prophet Elias, of whom similar wonders were related, and who had now returned in the same bodily presence in which he had once ascended to heaven; but no one thought of saluting Him as the promised harbinger of the Messianic epoch. Others, again, contented themselves with regarding Him as a prophet, even as one of the prophets (Mark vi. 14 f.). Mark has some justification for hinting that this thronging of a superstitious multitude, which only desired to witness miracles, or else to obtain assistance in bodily distress, was more a vexation to Jesus than a wished-for result of His activity.

The case was different in regard to the Galilean populace, at least in the narrower circle which witnessed Jesus' continuous ministry. A body of genuine adherents had there gathered about Jesus at an early date.[1] It certainly cannot be said that He did anything by which to separate this body of adherents from the people, or perhaps, as even Schleiermacher supposed, to unite them in a closer association by baptism in His name. Jesus was no founder of a sect,

[1] The oldest source seems to have made an express distinction between addresses to the multitudes, such as the so-called parabolic speech, and addresses to His followers, as, for example, the Sermon on the Mount. Mark, too, distinguishes repeatedly and designedly between the great multitudes and the circle of adherents, desirous of learning, which was gradually formed (Mark iii. 32, iv. 10); Luke is doubtless correct, however, in thinking of these as forming a considerable body (vi. 17). The Fourth Gospel has preserved the perfectly correct reminiscence, that all who were in any way closely associated with Jesus were termed His adherents, scholars, and disciples; for all that is originally involved in the description of them which the Gospel contains.

He had no desire to form a school; His ministry was directed to the people as a nation. The only outward difference between His followers and the people was, that the former constantly came back again (Luke xiv. 26 f.), followed His wandering expeditions in order to listen to Him (John vi. 66), and were both more zealous and more constant than the great multitude that now and again gathered round Him. In the first band of followers who after Jesus' death gathered together in Jerusalem, there were, besides the Twelve, those who had accompanied Him throughout His public ministry, probably from the commencement at least of His Galilean appearance (Acts i. 21 f.); the number included a few women, as, for example, Mary of Magdala, and another Mary, or Salome, the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Mark xv. 40 f.). Luke, too, has preserved the names of some of the women who belonged to Jesus' most zealous partisans, among them being Joanna, the wife of one of the chief officials about the court (viii. 3). It is impossible, however, that all could be in a position to follow Him continually, and of those named above this could only be true as a general rule. The greater number followed Him during a longer or shorter period; they appeared more or less frequently when He laboured publicly among the people, according as their circumstances permitted and they were impelled to do so by their felt need. This band of followers was therefore constantly altering; it increased or diminished just as the expectations which Jesus raised were strengthened or weakened. It is self-evident that there could be no such thing as a reception into this outer body of disciples or an exclusion from it; those came who felt themselves attracted by Jesus, and those who were not remained apart.

The inward attitude of these followers to Jesus was doubtless very varied; it is impossible to suppose that any definite recognition of His person formed the express or understood condition of discipleship.[1] But there can be no doubt that

[1] The Sermon on the Mount undoubtedly assumes that His disciples addressed Him as "Lord" (Luke vi. 46); but that is nothing more than a common expression of reverence, which even the fourth evangelist places in the mouth of the woman of Samaria before she had recognised Jesus to be a prophet (John iv. 11, 15). Even in the oldest source He is thus addressed by those who come

this circle, which again and again heard His proclamation of the kingdom of God, must in some measure have connected His appearance with the promised era of salvation, and that from them belief in Jesus must have penetrated to the outer circle of the people. His daily ministry of healing taught that Jehovah's succouring grace had appeared in Him, belief in that being indeed the condition of experiencing His miraculous assistance. The people learned day by day that He was a great prophet, according as they were affected by the power of His words and touched by the higher authority in which they were spoken (Mark i. 22). When He named Himself the Son of man, that designation pointed to the unique character of His appearance and calling. In an age, however, when the Messianic movement agitated the people so profoundly as had been the case ever since the days of the Baptist (Matt. xi. 12), it must have been almost impossible not to connect the national Messianic hopes with this appearance. But although there was much in the words of Jesus to confirm the hope that He would one day show Himself to be the God-sent Messiah, for the present there was no tangible indication that this was so. The Messianic future, as it was popularly conceived of, was impossible unless by the Messiah ascending the throne; and even faith in Jesus might only mean that He was regarded as a new preparer for the Messianic kingdom, although in a higher sense than the Baptist had been. Through the spiritual influence exerted by Jesus there must gradually have been matured among the number of His most zealous adherents an understanding that even His present ministry was the commencement of the establishment of that kingdom; and those who in this sense believed in Him as the Messiah, Jesus counted among the subjects of the kingdom (Matt. xi. 11). But doubtless even

seeking help (Matt. viii. 2, 6, xv. 22, xvii. 15); Mark seems rather to avoid the title, and Luke has a partiality for replacing it with some general expression, such as "Master;" the fact is, that both connected with the word the profounder meaning introduced into it by the later Christian Church, which was absolutely unknown to those who applied the title at first. Most frequently, however, He was addressed as Rabbi, because at His first appearance He had placed Himself on the same platform with the teachers of the people; and this title was to the last sufficient to express the reverence of His most intimate followers (Mark xiii. 1; John xx. 16).

this band was still possessed by the conviction that when the hour came Jesus would set about the establishment of the kingdom, as that was popularly expected; and it may also have been the case that many were true followers, believing in Him as the Messiah of the future, although they had a very slender appreciation of the real meaning of His present activity. The boundary line, therefore, between His followers and the people can never have been very strictly defined.

Those were adherents in this sense who gathered round Jesus on the banks of the Jordan, accompanied Him back to Galilee, and at a later date appeared with Him at the feast of Passover.[1] And it may be true that in the case of some, their connection with Jesus had even then taken the form of a permanent relationship. The case was somewhat different when Jesus began His baptismal ministry in Judea, in which He was as unable to do without assistance from His disciples as the Baptist had been (comp. p. 26). We do not know whether or not this service was always rendered by the same helpers; all that we are cognizant of is, that He returned home through Samaria, attended by a body of disciples (comp. p. 31). We have seen already, that whenever He commenced His true Messianic ministry, He surrounded Himself with a number of constant associates, choosing first of all the brothers from Capernaum (Matt. i. 16–20). We saw, then, how Jesus included with them the publican Levi (Mark ii. 14), and we also made the incidental acquaintance of another member of this band of followers (Matt. viii. 21). In the first Gospel as well as in Mark these constant companions of Jesus are always mentioned as being disciples in the stricter sense; His express permission was needed before any one could join the number, and that is represented as being solicited (Matt. viii. 19), indeed in certain circumstances as being refused (Mark v. 18); even His own command is in one instance disobeyed (Mark x. 21 f.) These disciples left home and calling, and united themselves with Jesus in one common life. They accompanied Him wherever He was

[1] It is an arbitrary supposition of criticism that John had disciples in the stricter sense in view, although it is he who has preserved most accurately the meaning of the term.

invited (Mark ii. 15), and wherever he took up His abode there they did the same, for it was obligatory on them to share that homeless existence of His (Matt. viii. 20); when He went upon a journey, no one might remain behind without special permission (viii. 21). Like the father of the family, He saw to their support, giving them daily bread (Luke xxiv. 35); they were sharers of His pleasures as well as of His privations. We cannot say what the number of these disciples may have been, but we saw in the preceding chapter that there were constant summonses to join the band; and so long as the circle was not closed, it is quite possible that even some who did not approve themselves left of their own accord or were ejected. There is not the slightest doubt, however, that this circle was finally closed, and that the number of those intimate apostles consisted of twelve.[1] In the Fourth Gospel John repeatedly puts the Twelve in mind of their own election (vi. 70, xv. 16); and a well-authenticated remark from the oldest source equally guarantees that their number was twelve, for the reference is to the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28; comp. Luke xxii. 30). Mark, however, has preserved a distinct recollection of the date at which Jesus completed His circle of apostles; for it is only to those his reminiscence can possibly refer. Those whom Jesus had already summoned to be His constant companions had long been associated with Him, and, of course, formed the groundwork of the apostolic band. What is therefore alluded to here is the completion of the destined number, and the closing of the circle.

[1] Even Schleiermacher thought it possible that this group was formed without any particular choice being exercised by Jesus, and that the number of which it consisted was both accidental and indifferent; but this idea has been condemned as unhistorical by the newer criticism—Strauss not excepted. The Acts of the Apostles assumes most distinctly the existence of twelve disciples, specially chosen by Jesus, the number of which, after the departure of Judas, could only be completed by the Messiah announcing through the lot what His will in the matter was (Acts i. 24–26). And not only so, but the struggle which Paul had for the acknowledgment of his claims could only have been caused by the superiority belonging to the Twelve by reason of their election during Jesus' earthly life. But Paul himself speaks of the Twelve as forming a band which was specially preferred by Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5), while the writer of the Apocalypse saw their names on the twelve foundation-stones of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 14).

It was on the very day of that great assembling of the people, which we have recently described, and after a long time spent among the multitudes, that Jesus retired to the mountain height. On this occasion He did not wait until those among His followers who were desirous of learning more had collected together round Him, but He called them to Him, or rather He caused the apostles who were already called to summon those whom He had selected. All who were called obeyed the summons, and the number of apostles was completed by their admission (Mark iii. 13 f.).[1] It is a favourite idea with the modern biographers of Jesus, that the choosing of the Twelve was the laying of the foundation-stone of a new Israel, perhaps even of a Church that would embrace the world. It is supposed, at any rate, that their selection was a declaration that the nation of the twelve tribes and the ancient Church was irreclaimable, and therefore doomed by God to destruction. But our Gospels are ignorant of all this, and the idea is, besides, absolutely unhistorical. Even the subsequent sending forth of these twelve shows that Jesus had by no means renounced the people as a people, indeed His whole activity was largely devoted to a true ministry among them; and we shall see that it was not until the circumstances were entirely altered that Jesus looked forward to the separation of His adherents from the people, although that was not to take place until after His death. Mark mentions expressly, that at first Jesus only purposed taking these twelve into His constant society, in order to form by them a centre for those who constituted that large and fluctuating band of disciples, and had experienced His personal influence in another way. It was this family life in common that made it possible for Him to cement a bond between the apostles and Himself sufficiently strong to link them to Him by personal attachment, enduring in the serious crisis through which even their faith would one day have to pass. It was only in such close association that they could receive the full

[1] Luke represents the proceeding with more solemnity, telling how Jesus passed the night in prayer before this momentous act, and how He then selected twelve from the larger circle (Luke vi. 12 f.); as usual, however, Mark's account is the more original of the two, but there is no probability that Luke regarded the Sermon on the Mount as an address at their ordination, for he places Mark's description of the popular assembly between.

impression of His life of love, so completely devoted as it was to His divine calling, and so full of the abnegation of self. It was in this life that the ideal of a perfect human existence was realized, as well as the task which they would later be called upon to undertake. The impression thus made must have become stronger day by day as the bond of affection and confidence was more securely fastened.

It has been supposed, but without any foundation, that the apostles underwent an apprenticeship for their subsequent calling. So far as He was able, Jesus would assuredly indoctrinate them in the Scriptures with which He was so intimately acquainted; certainly not, however, in order to instruct them in any particular method of exposition or application of Holy Writ; He would rather teach them how to draw from that fountain of life to which He went Himself. They were not intended to become teachers of the people, even in the sense in which Jesus might be so called, and much less, then, in the sense of the scribes of that day. Jesus does not seem to have communicated to them the special peculiarity of His method of teaching; for as far as we know, they never imitated His didactic method of employing parables. Jesus had no desire to form a school even from this limited body, and His purpose was certainly not to promulgate new doctrines concerning God and heavenly things. It was undoubtedly more practicable for Him to explain to this select number the divine decrees which He was come to accomplish, than to the mixed crowd of followers who surrounded Him during His public ministry. In the former case the ground was in some degree prepared, and He therefore met with greater receptivity; but it was no mysterious esoteric doctrine which He propounded. What He told them most privately was one day to be proclaimed upon the housetops (Matt. x. 26 f.). At first, indeed, they had to receive what He said to them on the authority of His person, and had to render the obedience which He demanded. They were intended to rise gradually to the full apprehension of the divine counsel whose purpose He was carrying out; but they were not to follow Him like servants, compelled to do their master's will without knowing the reason why, but as trusted friends, permitted to observe the animating motives as well

as the end in view (John xv. 15). A long course of instruction was necessary for this, not only of teaching, but of ethical education besides, designed to purify them more completely from the pride and ambition which were theirs by nature, as well as from egotism and frivolity; and also to guide them to the humble and gladsome exercise of loving sacrifice in which He was their pattern. The evangelist who recorded Peter's reminiscences is the one who lays most intentional emphasis upon the fact that the disciples' appreciation of such things was very slowly matured; he tells how frequently Jesus had to complain of their non-receptivity, and how many flaws in their inward life had to be removed before they were made fit for their calling. We now know that their duty was really nothing else than to testify after Jesus left them of what they had seen and heard, of what Jesus had been, and of what He desired to be to the nation (John xv. 27). But is it possible that even at that date Jesus had this future full in view? It must be borne in mind that, according to Mark's account, that fatal conflict with the Pharisees had begun not long before (Mark iii. 6), and Jesus was undoubtedly not deceived as to its full significance and far-reaching consequences; but we have seen already that these consequences were still far distant, and that His adversaries saw no sure prospect of the realization of their plans. But neither do we meet with any indication that at this period Jesus thought of the issue which they had in view; He therefore can scarcely have chosen His disciples with any distinct reference to their future destiny. Mark certainly preserves a genuine *historical* reminiscence when he says that Jesus set before His disciples first of all the mission which He intended them to undertake during His lifetime (Mark iii. 14 f.; comp. vi. 7).[1]

[1] It does not follow from this, however, that Jesus chose the Twelve in order to send them forth upon this mission, as Keim concludes, principally by reason of his absolutely uncritical preference for the first Gospel; there nothing is said of the selection of the apostles, nor even of the sending forth of the disciples, but the speech given on that occasion is related, though from topical reasons it is placed much earlier than in the other Gospels. It must be assumed in agreement with Mark, that the number of apostles was completed before the first sending forth of disciples, although this Gospel does not give us any data to fix the interval between the two events, which perhaps was not a long one. It is

As a matter of course, Jesus completed this band of twelve from the number of those who had hitherto been His most zealous adherents. It was therefore only natural that they should be—perhaps with only one exception—Galileans. We know nothing definite about their circumstances, except that the four from Capernaum were fishers by trade, and that Levi was a publican. The idea that they all belonged to the lower classes is only correct in so far as there could be said to be any difference in rank among the Jews (comp. p. 124, note). It cannot even be certainly assumed that none of them belonged to the learned professions, for we cannot tell whether the scribe, who at one time wished to become a disciple (Matt. vii. 19 f.), may not perhaps have ultimately been received into the number. In itself, certainly, the culture of the scribes was at that time so false and so obstructive to an entire resignation to Jesus, that it could only have been an exceptional case for Him to consider one of that class qualified. Nevertheless, however, He did not choose the relatively best even from a very limited number. They were plain and simple men of the people, whom He found were most unprejudiced, and from whom He could hope the best in regard to the religious and ethical instruction He purposed to bestow; the fact that in their case the fruit came slowly to maturity could certainly not deceive Him. It has been thought surprising that so few of the number were afterwards of any great historical importance. But apart from the fact that we are absolutely ignorant concerning the labours and fate of the great majority of them, it is generally forgotten that in the formation of this circle Jesus only purposed to form such a firm kernel in regard to which His ministry would achieve the greatest possible result in the

equally uncritical to assume that Jesus Himself gave names to His chosen ones, by proceeding upon a statement in Luke (vi. 13), or even to suppose that this is a fact because John and he both introduce the names of the apostles into Jesus' addresses (Luke xi. 49; John xiii. 16). The first evangelist mentions incidentally the Twelve as apostles in his account of their sending forth (Matt. x. 2), Mark in his account on their return from the same (vi. 30), Luke on other occasions (Luke xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10), besides in this passage (ix. 10); but they are generally termed the Twelve or the disciples. It is therefore highly improbable that in view of their immediate calling, not to speak of their future one, Jesus bestowed names on them which had a reference to their mission.

circumstances. Jesus never attempted to define in what degree each individual should participate in the task which was eventually to devolve upon the band of apostles, and in any case it was impossible that it could be shared in equally. It undoubtedly follows from this that the number twelve had only a symbolical significance (comp. Matt. xix. 28). Jesus was aware that His mission was to the Jews and to them alone, and therefore He had to give the band of disciples, whom He wished to participate in His ministry, the stamp of their significance for the nation of the twelve tribes, to whom He especially sent them on their first mission (Matt. x. 5). It is possible that among the many who at this period thronged together from all quarters of the land (Mark iii. 8), there were Gentiles both from within and beyond the borders of the Holy Land, and that Jesus considered it needful to make it clear through symbolical language that He knew the calling of Himself and His disciples to be specially destined for Israel, in conformity with the promise.

The list of apostles has given rise to much hypercriticism in regard to the difference presented in the various versions, the order in which the names are given, and the agreements as well as the deviations presented by the Gospels in their divisions. But it is true even in regard to this, that the narrative of the first evangelist (Matt. x. 2–4), and that which Luke gives in both his documents (Luke vi. 14–16; Acts i. 13), are simply taken from Mark, though trifling deviations are found in them; without considering some motives very likely to weigh with him in the arrangement, Mark seems to have jotted them down as they occurred to him (iii. 16–19). It cannot be supposed that the apostles follow in the order in which they were called; for an indefinite number of them were early summoned, while the remainder entered the apostolic circle simultaneously; still less would the arrangement be according to rank, for Jesus Himself incidentally reproved the apostles for disputing about such a matter (Mark ix. 33). Both points of view were influential only in so far as the four fishermen who were first called naturally take precedence;[1] for no thoughtful

[1] The two pairs of brothers were either taken together (Matt. x. 2; Luke vi. 14), or else Jesus' three confidants were put first, and Andrew followed after,

criticism has disputed the fact that a yet narrower circle of confidants was formed by Simon and the two sons of Zebedee. They appear as Jesus' most intimate attendants at the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mark v. 37), were afterwards present upon the mountain of transfiguration (ix. 2), and in Gethsemane (xiv. 33); on one occasion Andrew is associated with them (xiii. 3), and he is also mentioned incidentally by the Fourth Gospel (John i. 41, vi. 8, xii. 22).

These brothers are usually followed by Philip, who had made Jesus' acquaintance at the Jordan (John i. 44 f.). Although it is not improbable that he was one of the early chosen, it is impossible to prove it, for we have no evidence whatever for the ancient tradition that Philip was the disciple who asked permission to go and bury his father (Matt. viii. 21). Along with him Bartholomew is generally mentioned, indeed the first evangelist made them into a special pair; the Acts of the Apostles is the only exception to this rule. It is a fact that in the Fourth Gospel Philip appears to be more intimate with Nathanael (i. 46), and that the latter name does not appear in the list of the apostles, although Nathanael is generally represented by John as being closely connected with the apostles (John xxi. 2); the supposition that Nathanael was another name for Bartholomew has long been current, and has been accepted even by critics such as Keim. It is said that the latter name was only his patronymic, describing him as the son of a certain Tolmai or Talmai (Josh. xv. 14; 2 Sam. iii. 3, xiii. 37), and therefore Nathanael, which was none the less a common name in the Old Testament (Num. i. 8; 1 Chron. ii. 14, xxiv. 6), may probably have been his proper name. On the other hand, the name Matthew, which is similar in signification, appears to have been a surname given to the publican Levi by Jesus Himself (comp. p. 125, note). Doubting Thomas is usually placed alongside Matthew, and is generally described as an upright man of slow apprehension. There must have

as is done by Mark and the Acts of the Apostles; the latter, however, places John, whose importance for the Church was greater, before his older brother James. In what follows no attention need be paid to Strauss, who saw in the three confidants of the Gospels only an anticipation of the subsequent apostolic triumvirate (Gal. ii. 9), in which the son of Zebedee was put in the place of the brother of Jesus.

been something melancholy about him as well, for he was the first to seize on the idea that the Master was going forward to death (John xi. 16), and notwithstanding all the soothing declarations of Jesus concerning His departure, he continued in absolute darkness as to the ultimate goal to which He was advancing (xiv. 5); nor would he credit the glad news of the resurrection until he had received incontrovertible testimony of its having taken place (xx. 24 f.). The joyful resignation with which he is prepared to go with Jesus to death (xi. 16), and the boldness with which he rises to the highest expression of faith whenever the great hope is absolutely demonstrated to him (xx. 28), show indeed that he was no ordinary doubter. His appellation, too, can hardly be a proper name, for it is really the Aramaic form of the Hebrew for twin, as John has repeatedly explained it to mean.

All the lists represent James, the son of Alphæus, as coming after these names (Mark iii. 18). Since Alphæus and Clopas are probably both of them Grecian variations of the same Hebrew name, and since Mary, the wife of Clopas, whom John numbers among the women who followed Jesus to the cross (xix. 25), is probably identical with the Mary mentioned by Mark at the same place, and who is called there the mother of James the less and of Joses (xv. 40), the Apostle James was therefore, in all probability, the son of this Mary and Alphæus, and was termed "the less" either on account of his stature or in order to distinguish him from the son of Zebedee.[1] Since, however, that Levi, who was known as the Apostle Matthew, was also son of an Alphæus (Mark ii. 14), he must be regarded as the brother of the first James, unless

[1] This James is frequently represented as being a cousin of Jesus, either by making his father Clopas a brother of Jesus' foster-father, or his mother Mary a sister of the mother of Jesus; this latter supposition is in itself highly improbable on account of the similarity in the names of the two sisters, and by no means follows from John xix. 25 (comp. vol. i. p. 366). The real purpose of the endeavour to prove this was to transform the so-called brothers of Jesus into cousins, who had either been adopted by Joseph or were only brothers by name (comp. vol. i. p. 281). It is perfectly arbitrary to regard these so-called brothers of Jesus, who are always associated with His mother, as other than actual sons of Mary, and equally so to regard one of those brothers as having been an apostle, for, according to John vii. 5, he continued unbelieving during Jesus' life on earth; and not less so is it to identify this James Alphæus with James the Lord's brother, who was afterwards head of the Church in Jerusalem.

this is all owing to the strangest accident. In Mark the two are separated by Thomas; but since one of the apostles is called a twin, it is most natural to suppose that he was the twin brother of another. Is it possible that he was perhaps the brother of that Levi who became a publican while his brother continued a fisherman (John xxi. 2); or was he no other than that Joses who appears along with James as a son of Mary (Mark xv. 40), making this therefore his proper name? If so, then one of the women who most faithfully followed Jesus brought Him her three sons. It is impossible, however, that the Thaddæus who comes next in order in Mark had any intimate relationship with James, as has been inferred from Luke, who mentions, instead of him, a certain Judas, who is also recognised in the Fourth Gospel (John xiv. 22).[1] By no analogy whatever can it be supposed that he was the brother of that James from whom Luke separates him (Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13); all that is meant is that he was the son of a certain James, and was so called in order to distinguish him from the Judas with whom Luke associates him. There is in this case the less reason for doubting the identity, for Judas was a frequent proper name, while Thaddæus is probably a surname, indicative, perhaps, of the fact that he was the darling of his parents. It was not unnatural to enumerate those disciples last whose names bore a resemblance to each other; for, besides two being called James and two Judas, there was also a second Simon among the number of the Twelve. He was distinguished from Simon Peter by a surname, by which Mark, who calls him the Canaanite, seems to indicate the place of his birth; scarcely, however, with justification. It is more probable that Luke is correct in naming him the zealot, *i.e.* a member of that party of Zealots in whom, since the days of the Gaulonites, revolutionary sparks had glimmered. The fact that Jesus secured

[1] It has been endeavoured in this way to make a second brother of the Lord (Mark vi. 3)—the Judas to whom we owe the Epistle in our canon—a cousin of Jesus', and to place him among the apostles. In our manuscripts he is also called Lebbæus, or Lebbæus with the surname Thaddæus; but it is a mistake to suppose that this name was original in Matthew. Its introduction is probably owing to the fact that the name Levi was thus Grecianized in order to connect it with James the son of Alphæus, taken from Mark ii. 14, and that is a most untenable combination.

one from such a society to adopt His conception of the kingdom of God, shows what mighty power He possessed over the spirits of men.

We can understand why the disciple who was afterwards his Master's betrayer was, with undoubted reference to this fact, always mentioned last in the enumeration of the apostles (Mark iii. 19).[1] It has indeed been regarded as so incomprehensible why Jesus took this Judas into His band of disciples at all, that many have preferred to assume that that body was gradually formed without any direct assistance on the part of Jesus; and that this much is incontestable, that Jesus could not have taken him with the knowledge that he would prove His traitor. This revolting idea is only gathered from a plainly mistaken interpretation of what is said by the fourth evangelist (John vi. 64); it removes every ethical connection between Jesus and the disciple, because it condemns Jesus to a continuous concealment of His knowledge of the heart. It dare not be said, however, that Jesus, in receiving Judas, was influenced by circumstances of which we are entirely ignorant, but which may have made it appear hazardous to repulse this richly endowed if dangerous man, or that it seemed to Him to be a leading of providence that He should not exclude one whom He knew to be unworthy. Jesus knew that He was not in subjection to a blind fate, and His action in conscious harmony with the will of His heavenly Father never knew the pressure of outward circumstances. Indeed, after considering all that the Gospels tell of His penetrating acumen, no one could dare to suppose that He was deceived in this disciple. But is it necessary then to assume something? Was it needful, or even only conceivable, that Judas was always in heart a traitor, or did he only gradually become so? It is certain that this disciple, like the rest of them, was no finished, matured personality when he joined himself to Jesus; and it is equally certain that, as in the case of all, his enthusiasm

[1] The surname Iscariot, which he bore, according to Mark, doubtless referred to the fact that his home was in a town called Kerioth, within the limits of Judea (Josh. xv. 25). According to the Fourth Gospel, however, his father Simon was known by the Grecianized surname of Iscariot (John vi. 71), and it has been surmised, not without some justification, that the father having removed to Galilee, was there known by the name of his original domicile, and that therefore one who was by birth a Jew was among Jesus' disciples.

for Jesus was united with much uncertainty as to what might be expected from Him. There cannot be the slightest doubt that all the disciples looked upon the fulfilment of the politico-national hopes of the people as the goal to which Jesus would conduct them; and therefore those who were His most intimate associates would connect with this expectation ambitious hopes and worldly aspirations of their own. The other disciples, too, were not without great weaknesses and faults of character, which were certainly no secret to Jesus, indeed it was in order to subdue these that He admitted them as disciples to daily intercourse; and if He was aware of the great dangers hidden in Judas' character, He could also hope to get the mastery over them through the power of His spirit and the fulness of His love. On the other hand, Judas must have possessed special endowments for Jesus to consider it desirable to secure him as a disciple; and we need not be surprised that his talents belonged precisely to a sphere with which the plain men had little acquaintance, and in which, as Jesus Himself said, the children of light are generally surpassed by the children of the world (Luke xvi. 8).

It is not usually taken into account that the outward circumstances of Jesus' life were essentially altered from the moment when He surrounded Himself with a band of twelve disciples. Means of His own Jesus certainly had not. We do not possess the slightest indication that He followed His trade while engaged in His public ministry; indeed, everything we know of this activity seems to show that He did not do so. So long as He was only accompanied by the four fisher apostles, their common support can have presented no difficulties; the sons of Zebedee came from a substantial home; Simon, too, can scarcely have been altogether without substance, and the publican was certainly not destitute of means when He came to Jesus. In Capernaum and Bethlehem Jesus knew that the houses of His disciples and followers were open to Him at any time, and in the narrow circle in which He laboured there were doubtless many houses which regarded it as the highest honour to lodge the great Rabbi and His followers. Sometimes He was invited and sometimes He invited Himself (Mark ii. 15; Luke vii. 36);

Eastern hospitality, which is usually on a magnificent scale, pays small regard to number. And it would hardly signify if occasionally no sheltering roof was at hand, for in Palestine a night passed under the starry heavens gives no cause for alarm; indeed, that is the time generally selected for making a journey, and Jesus used it more than once for undisturbed communion with His heavenly Father. The inference that He was oppressed with poverty is drawn from some dogmatic statements of the Apostle Paul by a thoroughly perverted exegesis (2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 7). Besides, a native of the East needs little to sustain life, and Jesus certainly did not seek for good cheer.

But these circumstances were undoubtedly changed when He surrounded Himself with a band of followers, the number of which did not permit Him to claim the hospitality of His friends without ceremony. It was then requisite to provide in a regular manner for the support of this tiny company of thirteen souls. How this was accomplished in detail we cannot tell. Each of the disciples undoubtedly contributed as much as he could, either from his own means or that of his family. In so far as there was historical reality in the community of goods existing in the primitive Church at Jerusalem, that must have been in imitation of the life which the disciples passed with Jesus. It is at an early date that we first hear of the women who assisted Him out of their possessions (Luke viii. 3). For that valuable garment which was without a seam (John xix. 23), Jesus was doubtless indebted to these busy women's hands; but the services which they are said to have rendered (Mark xv. 41) probably went far beyond that. It is certain that not only was the little company without pressing want, but it was even able to think of giving alms (John xiii. 29). All this, however, required a regulated administration of the exchequer; and for that there was needed a man who could superintend the expenditure, and was capable of dealing with large sums of money. Such a man Jesus found in Judas; only the perfectly ungrounded distrust of the Fourth Gospel, which is entertained by criticism, can lead to doubt being cast upon what it says as to the box and its management being entrusted to him (John xii. 6, xiii. 29).

And thus into the centre of the apostolic circle itself had the enemy penetrated, whose wiles Jesus knew only too well. But this does not mean that Judas was animated by Satan from the beginning. He had then far higher aims than enriching himself with the savings of his fellow-disciples; as yet, love to Jesus surpassed his love for temporal possessions, nor would he himself think of serving two masters. It was not until the circumstances had greatly altered that the task, given him by Jesus because of his peculiar aptitude for it, became a snare. For in the counsel of God it depends upon a man himself whether his talents and labour procure him a blessing or a curse.

## CHAPTER VII.

### CALUMNY.

THE action of Jesus which most excited the enthusiasm of the populace was His expulsion of demons. The result of His word of power was more directly visible in these cases, and in quite a different way than in His other miracles of healing, excepting, perhaps, the cures of some of those who were paralyzed; in these expulsions there was no question of subduing natural evils, but Jesus appeared as the controller of supernatural powers. It was to this point the Pharisees had to direct their attention if they desired to succeed in destroying Jesus' influence with the people, or in awakening mistrust in His person. They believed they had found an effectual means to this end when they spread the report that He was in league with the devil himself, through whose power He effected these miraculous exorcisms. This apparently involved a recognition of these extraordinary successes of His which the people could not be dissuaded from believing in, since they beheld them before their eyes; and yet it suggested at the same time a most injurious suspicion which must discredit Him with the people for all time coming. The calumny could be extended at will so as to cover the whole of Jesus' miracles, and that is a fresh proof what an insecure expedient it would have been if Jesus had founded upon them the recognition of His person. An age to which a superhuman realm of evil was an undoubted reality, and which believed in demoniacal as well as in divine miracles, could not be convinced by the mere fact of superhuman results that they were of divine origin, whenever the authorities, whose judgment in regard to religious matters was decisive, believed that they had grounds for explaining them by the action of demoniacal powers.

The remembrance of this calumny, and the motives which led to its being made, have been preserved in the oldest

source. In order to give adequate representation to it, the account is connected with a short narrative of another such expulsion of demons which resulted in the organs of speech, hitherto bound by the power of the evil one, being at once unloosened, thus enabling the unfortunate mute to speak. It describes how, in consequence of this miracle, the multitudes were seized with fresh astonishment. Such expulsions of demons had never before been seen in Israel. Jesus had succeeded in doing by a single word what the Jewish conjurors claimed to effect by all manner of mysterious methods, mystical manipulations, and diffuse conjurations. It was on some such occasion as this that the Pharisees said that Jesus cast out devils by the help of Beelzebub the prince of the devils (Matt. ix. 32–34; comp. Luke xi. 14 f.); and Mark still preserves the reminiscence that the great authorities as to the teaching of the law, who dwelt in Jerusalem, were then appealed to, and in such matters their opinion would necessarily be decisive for the multitude (Mark iii. 22).[1] He has also correctly explained the reproach to mean that Jesus Himself was necessarily possessed by the devil or by Beelzebub, if He expelled the demons in their power. At a much later period John reported that the rumour of Jesus' being demoniacally possessed, which originated in this calumny, was current among the people (John vii. 20, viii. 48, 52, x. 20).

In the oldest source special emphasis was laid upon the

[1] The first evangelist put the introductory narrative (ix. 32–34) into his great description of Jesus' miraculous cures, and therefore replaces it here, where, following the oldest source, he gives Jesus' defence against this calumny (Matt. xii. 25–37; comp. Luke xi. 17–23), by a similar history (Matt. xii. 22–24), in which he lays emphasis upon the fact that the people, even when, in contrast to Jesus' followers, they did not believe in Jesus' Messiahship, yet precisely because of these undoubted tokens of regal authority, might be led astray in their unbelief. Mark's imputation against the scribes from Jerusalem is explicable by the fact that among the crowds which came together to see the great Prophet (iii. 8) there were doubtless many teachers of the law. But there is no foundation whatever for the supposition that a formal accusation to the Council had been planned, bringing against Jesus the charges of sorcery and alliance with the devil. Mark is manifestly followed by the first evangelist as to the arrangement in his relation of this calumniation and Jesus' response, and he plainly refers to another calumny (iii. 21), and introduces what is properly another narrative (iii. 22–30); the oldest source, too, which is followed by Luke in chap. x., manifestly gathered anti-Pharisaic addresses from very different periods, and therefore we cannot do more than fix approximately the time of Jesus' answer to this charge.

fact that Jesus saw through the malicious purpose of this calumny, which His opponents themselves could not possibly have believed in, and thereupon began to expose its inconsistency. Although directed properly to the Pharisees, His address was intended for His followers and the multitude as well. On the occasion when He defended Himself against this charge, we must therefore suppose Him surrounded by a great concourse of people who had just witnessed such an expulsion of demons. He proceeded in this case also to do so by means of a parable: "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." How foolish, then, to suppose that the devil would give any one power to cast out demons when they are his own peculiar instruments and servants! That would be a case indeed of the devil raging against himself, and "If Satan casteth out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand?" (Matt. xii. 25 f.; comp. Luke xi. 17 f.).[1] By means of a second argument Jesus pointed out that when they supposed it was only possible to cast out demons in the power of the devil, by so doing they condemned the expulsions of the Jewish exorcists, who were their pupils. Thus they were themselves convicted of calumny, for they must have known assuredly that their pupils were not in league with Satan. It was, of course, ironically that Jesus apparently placed His expulsions of demons upon the same level as those of the Jewish exorcists; He did so in order to convince His opponents of the inconsistency of their charge (comp. p. 85); for from their standpoint they must have been unable to distinguish any real difference between the two procedures. If they did so, however, that would involve the reluctant admission that His expulsions of demons were of quite a different character from those of their pupils, and that genuinely superhuman powers were efficacious in what He performed. When Jesus therefore demonstrated how absurd it was to refer these to demoniacal power, He might regard it as conceded that they must then be referred to God's Spirit

[1] It has been attempted to dispute these popular arguments by saying that discord and unfaithfulness are inherent in the nature of the wicked one; but wherever its own interest is in question, *i.e.* in regard to its opposition against good, the realm of the evil one is always united within itself.

and power, since there could not be a third alternative. But if this were the case, it followed that the kingdom of God had come (Matt. xii. 27 f.; comp. Luke xi. 19 f.). For wherever the dominion of demoniacal powers had been destroyed by the power of God, a beginning had been made of divine sovereignty. This was why Jesus now announced for the first time to the assembled multitude that in Him and His ministry the kingdom of God was actually realized. For the consummation of the theocracy there was therefore no necessity for the re-establishment of the Davidic kingdom, as they expected would be done; with this mighty subduing of Satan's instruments the power of the devil was broken upon earth, and it alone had stood in the way of that consummation; this was also involved in Jesus' expulsions of demons. He did not even say here that because of His effecting this consummation He must necessarily be the Messiah; but in a parable connected with an Old Testament figure (Isa. xlix. 24 f.), He presented this conclusion to the people: "When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace; but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils" (Luke xi. 21 f.). The strong man must therefore be vanquished by a stronger, if the instruments by which Satan has governed the world are to be destroyed, and the unhappy victims who are under his control are to be taken from him. Who, however, can be stronger than Satan, unless it be God's ambassador — the Messiah? And how can He destroy the kingdom of Satan, if He has not previously subdued Satan himself? Jesus pointed out, therefore, that His ministry among the people must have been preceded in His personal experience by a struggle with Satan, out of which He had come forth the conqueror; the history of the Temptation gives us an example of this (comp. Book II. chap. x.). The decisive fact by which the kingdom of God was to be established upon earth was not the ascension of the throne by the Messiah, but the victory over Satan, which has been won by the Chosen of God in His sinless life.[1]

[1] In rejecting this portion of the speech, which he took from the apostolic source, Luke has undoubtedly preserved the first parable more correctly than

The speech was thus far a defence of Jesus, and an explanation from His standpoint of His demoniac expulsions. Now, however, it was directed against the Pharisees, who had clearly made known their malicious purpose by the reproach which had just been proved absurd. What can have been the real reason for this malicious design of theirs? They were not on the side of Jesus, nor would they connect themselves with Him as disciples, and therefore they had necessarily to take up a position of positive enmity towards Him. They had no wish to further His work among the people; therefore they must necessarily endeavour to hinder it, and to destroy His influence with the people by their slanderous statements (Matt. xii. 30). It was impossible to remain neutral, for the supreme crisis and crucial question for humanity was at issue; it was necessary to declare either for Jesus or against Him. He, however, had done His part in warning them. It may be that blasphemy against the Son of man will be forgiven, for that is frequently owing to the fact of its not being recognised who He is, conversion being therefore still possible when knowledge is perfected. But the operation of the Divine Spirit is directly made known to man; and Jesus proved incontrovertibly that it was manifested in His casting out of devils. Whoever, therefore, blasphemes this Holy Spirit, exhibiting by so doing a conscious and determined enmity towards God, is no longer capable of repentance, and is thus shut out from forgiveness; because in his case the indispensable presupposition for that is lacking (Matt. xii. 31 f.; comp. Luke xii. 10). The idea of a deadly sin, for which there could be no forgiveness, was no strange one to His auditors; for in the Old Testament order of worship there was undoubtedly a sin-offering for sins of ignorance and omission, but not for sins of arrogance, *i.e.* for conscious and intentional outrage against Jehovah and His law (Num. xv. 30 f.). Jesus

he has the second (ver. 17). Mark has taken nothing besides those two parables (iii. 23–27), but has redacted the latter more thoughtfully, without giving such prominence as Luke does to the connection with the Old Testament or to the thought of the decisive victory; in comparing the instruments of Satan with the household furnishings of the strong man, he has manifestly introduced an allegorizing touch. The first evangelist, who regards this as spoliation (Matt. xii. 29), has certainly followed Mark, for even the second half of ver. 25 exhibits traces of his influence.

had indeed come to offer forgiveness to all repentant sinners, but it was none the less true that conscious and intentional hardening of heart against the power of God, as revealed in His words and works, closed every path to conversion, and therefore became a deadly sin which could not be forgiven. Jesus did not intend to say that the Pharisees were already guilty of this transgression. But after He has cut off every escape in regard to the divine revelation manifested in His expulsions of demons, they have to face the question whether or not they will commit this sin.[1] Only one word is needed, and the unpardonable sin has been committed; but that word comes from the heart, and by it the condition of the heart can be as certainly recognised as the tree is by its fruit. Jesus here referred to the parabolic picture from the Sermon on the Mount (vii. 17 f.); only in this case He did not draw His inference from the fruits of the tree, but, relying upon the verdict of all experience, that every tree bears fruit of its kind only, He gave the true explanation of their wicked, blasphemous language, "How can ye, being evil, speak good things?" The evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth evil things (xii. 33–35). Certainly there is no need here for the Baptist's words concerning the offspring of vipers, which, although Jesus assuredly did not copy them, the evangelist has inserted in order to show how this speech brought the conflict with the Pharisees nearer to a climax. He had dared before

[1] Matt. xii. 30 is confirmed by Luke xi. 23, and xii. 31 f. by Mark iii. 28 f., as being constituent parts of the address; only the latter—and following him the first evangelist—amplifies the remarks by putting blasphemy against the Holy Ghost in contrast with all other sins and profanities, in order that blasphemy against the Son of man might appear as the greatest among them (comp. Luke xii. 10). Luke omitted the entire conclusion of the speech, because he thought himself obliged to refer here to what was said about the return of the evil spirit (xi. 24–26), and thus lost the connection for what followed; but we know that he had met with it in his source from the fact of his employing Matt. xii. 33–35 in the Sermon on the Mount (Luke vi. 44 f.); and the original form of the saying about blasphemy against the Spirit, which is preserved in Luke xii. 10, is referred by him to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit speaking through the apostles (Luke xii. 11 f.). He employed the remark without any reference to its original historical connection, and just so has the dogmatic view, proceeding upon these words, speculated upon the sin against the Holy Ghost. By so doing it has only rendered the meaning obscure, while in the historical connection of this speech it is perfectly transparent, and allows of a simple and practical application.

the whole people to describe these patterns of virtue as so absolutely wicked that a malicious calumny like this was not a momentary aberration, but the natural fruit of their evil hearts. But even in this respect the address moderates its language when it descends to an earnest exhortation of practical application. It calls to mind the profound solemnity of the divine judgment, when men must give an account of every idle word which is without a purpose, and is therefore lacking in moral justification: "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned" (xii. 36 f.).

The oldest source appears to have represented a scene as taking place immediately after this speech, which is in no respect connected with it topically, and can therefore only be given in this place by reason of historical recollection. While Jesus was still speaking, it was announced to Him that His mother and His brethren stood without, desiring to speak with Him (Matt. xii. 46).[1] The whole situation is clear to us. Jesus is surrounded by a great multitude, in the midst of which He has just uttered these words against the Pharisees; it is impossible to reach Him without difficulty (comp. Luke viii. 19), but by passing the news from one to another He hears at last that His relatives are present. According to Mark, they had come there in order to take Jesus into safety, for it was commonly reported that He was beside Himself (Mark iii. 21). The state of the matter is explained by the evangelist himself, for he has just before related how the house into which Jesus had entered was so thronged with people, and the calls upon Him were so many, that neither He nor the disciples could so much as eat bread (iii. 20).[2]

[1] The direct connection has only been preserved by Mark (iii. 31), who mistakenly, however, supposes that the scene took place in a house (comp. iii. 19); by mentioning the motive of the visit he has restored a certain topical connection between this scene and the preceding (iii. 21 f.). The first evangelist did not wish to separate the two great controversial speeches which he gives in chap. xii., and has on that account placed this anecdote at the close of the second (Matt. xii. 46–50). But even in Luke xi. 27 f. we shall find an indirect proof that it stood between the two addresses in the oldest source. Luke places it after the parable of the sower, by which it is followed in Matthew and Mark (Luke viii. 19–21), because it seemed to him as if its theme (viii. 21) was a further development of the interpretation of the fruit-bearing seed (viii. 14).

[2] The fact that the introduction of this notice suits the pragmatism of Mark,

It is a most arbitrary assertion, therefore, to say that this gives us a glimpse into a state of family discord of which there is not the slightest trace in the evangelic narratives of Jesus' birth and infancy (comp. vol. i. p. 226). It is said that Jesus was pronounced insane by His mother and brethren (comp. John x. 20), and that they seemed to have wished to secure Him, perhaps even to shut Him up in a madhouse. Of course then the Pharisees were accessory to this, and indeed had instigated this proceeding on the part of His relatives.[1] But Mark's elucidation shows clearly that this statement refers to a morbid excitement with which Jesus was supposed to be affected, because He had given Himself up to such a fretting activity; instead of doing what He could to allay the popular agitation, it was believed that He provoked it afresh by the way in which He entered into it. It is a mean supposition to regard such a resignation to His calling as an exaggerated proceeding, evincing the loss of all self-control. Nothing was more natural than for Jesus' nearest relatives, when they received perhaps a highly-coloured account of His doings, such as would probably be presented by the usual desire to exaggerate, to set out, in their anxiety on His account, to do what they could for Him who seemed no longer able to care

does not mean, of course, that it is imaginary. It has been remarked, and with reason, that this strange conduct on the part of Jesus' nearest kindred could certainly not be invented; the report of it must rest upon historical reminiscences. Down to the present day, however, the clear connection in Mark has been opposed by many, and even a critic such as Keim assumes that the "friends" spoken of in Mark iii. 21 were by no means His mother and brethren who are mentioned in iii. 31.

[1] This marvellous conception has the presumption to support itself on the letter of the statement. The question is certainly important, whether Mark meant that the relations had themselves pronounced Jesus to be insane, or whether that was said to them; for if this were the reason for their action, it is evident that they must have believed in its truth. But it is certain, nevertheless, that not only may the letter of the statement be taken to mean that others told it to them, but the connection requires indeed that the relatives, who had not been eye-witnesses of His ministry, but now came to Him for the first time, could form no opinion as to His condition. The assumption that this was described as insanity neither corresponds with Mark's customary way of speaking nor with the connection. For Mark repeatedly employs the same expression when speaking of the amazement of those who beheld Jesus' miracles (ii. 12, v. 42, vi. 51); it is certainly impossible to understand how madness can be inferred from the fact that Jesus was prevented from eating by the throng of people,—a fact by which Mark explains the rumour.

for Himself. Even without recollecting Mark's preference for vivid expressions, we cannot but pronounce it absurd that Jesus' friends should ever have entertained the idea of taking possession of Him by force. It is probable that they simply meant to withdraw Him from His activity, and by concealing Him in the family circle to protect Him from further importunity and fretting activity. The expression used only makes it necessary to suppose that they intended, if need be, to do this by gentle compulsion if He should, in His exaggerated excitement, be no longer able to spare Himself, and therefore they believed themselves called upon to exercise a little force in His own interest.

The whole account, therefore, does not exhibit the least trace of any internal alienation, but plainly proves the easily understood care and anxiety which, if somewhat limited, was exceedingly well-intentioned, bestowed on the member of the family who had been too long removed from the others. With the question as to their belief in Jesus, this whole story has nothing whatever to do. We certainly do know that His brethren had no faith in Him, and never belonged to His closer band of disciples; and that manifestly because they made their conviction of His Messiahship dependent upon His public appearance in the sense of the politico-national expectation (John vii. 5; comp. ver. 3 f.). But precisely because they had heard from childhood of the promises resting upon the firstborn brother, they must have looked with intense expectation towards this end. And must they not have been sorely puzzled by the fact that, in spite of Jesus' prolonged public appearance, that consummation did not seem to be a step nearer? Indeed, it could not be said that He was now the Messiah as expected by His most attached followers; and His brethren had not attained as they had to the firm conviction that He and no other would ultimately prove to be the Messiah. This want of faith is accounted for by the fact that His brethren were not influenced, as His disciples were, by His spiritual activity, but, like John the Baptist, were only able to compare from afar, with what they heard of Jesus' action, the picture which they had formed for themselves, on the ground of prophecy, of the appearance of the Messiah. This makes it sufficiently comprehensible why, during His life on earth,

they were always dubious whether He who certainly failed in fulfilling some essential parts of prophecy was really the expected one; and they would just as little be protected from doubt by the revelations which appeared in Jesus, as the Baptist was by tidings of promises that had been made long before. It may undoubtedly be asked why it was His nearest relatives—as is shown by the narrative itself, when it reports their visit as being something worthy of mention—who kept back from associating with Him, and therefore deprived themselves of the blessed influences of His spiritual ministry. But the wonder expressed at this is founded upon an assumption which is perfectly comprehensible from our standpoint, although absolutely unhistorical. This is that Jesus' ministry of teaching formed the true kernel and aim of His Messianic activity, while in truth it was only preparative for the ultimate goal. It seems to be only too conceivable that those who believed themselves to have been early indoctrinated into these things, waited in the quiet of their own homes until God's hand should lead Jesus to the accomplishment of this end, and did not feel themselves required to testify their allegiance to Him by joining the band of disciples. Surprise is perhaps felt that Jesus did not Himself attempt to produce in them another conception of His earthly ministry. But the fact of their having belonged from the beginning to the Church which originated after His death, shows that, in spite of the scepticism which during His life on earth they may have endeavoured to silence unavailingly, they shared in the highest blessings which He brought for His people. Jesus certainly never doubted that this would be so, even during the time when it still depended upon the bearing of the people to His preparative ministry in what form these blessings should be realized. The narrative is not only silent as to whether or not His mother shared the doubts of the brethren, but every shadow of proof is lacking for this common supposition.

Nothing of the kind is involved in the words spoken by Jesus when their presence was announced to Him, "Who is my mother and my brethren? Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother"

(comp. Mark iii. 33–35).[1] This has frequently been looked upon as showing a most unaccountable severity towards the members of His family, which is only explicable by a deep-rooted inner estrangement from them, or at least by such a renunciation of natural sentiment as He had demanded from His followers on His own account (comp. Matt. viii. 22). On the other hand, attempts have been made to remove this apparent harshness by all kinds of artificial combinations. It has been supposed that the friends were brought there by the Pharisees, in order to put an end to this disagreeable lecture, or at least that they had eagerly seized at the announcement of their presence for attaining this end, thereby explaining why these words are directed more against them than the relatives. The relations have even been charged with a love for ostentation, according to which, instead of seeking Jesus in the house, they caused Him to be summoned without, in order that they might be rebuked for doing so. To say this, however, is to overlook the fact that even the oldest source, which tells us nothing as to the motive of their coming, represents Jesus as being interrupted in the work of His calling by the announcement of the arrival of friends, who had only sought Him out from personal considerations. By these labours He was fulfilling the will of God, and did not wish to be disturbed in His calling, even by those with whom He was closely connected. This was what led Him to declare that He recognised yet closer bonds than those of blood relationship, and that all were His relations in a spiritual sense who showed that they resembled Him in character by their like zeal in the accomplishment of the divine will. This apothegm does not involve any antagonism against certain persons, but it is a concrete paraphrase of the conception of closest relationship.[2] There is no indication as to whether or

[1] The representation of this scene is probably not the original one in any of the Gospels; that can only be conjectured at by a critical comparison of texts. Luke's is manifestly the most complete. Instead of a vivid delineation of Jesus' statement in the form of question and answer, he gives its fundamental ideas by laying greater emphasis, in a reminder of chap. viii. 14, upon the fact that the performance of the divine will is hearing and doing the word of God (ver. 21).

[2] It was probably Mark who first drew attention to the fact that during Jesus' life on earth His blood relations did not belong to His discipular following. He

not His blood relations were also His true kindred in this sense. The announcement of their arrival was only a suggestion of the one kind, and their interruption of the labours of His calling caused Jesus to contrast, not others with them, but the ideal of spiritual resemblance to Him with the personal relationship connecting Him with His kindred.

These words, therefore, contain no disapproving condemnation of the members of His family, and it is almost more than marvellous that people should have disputed whether or not Jesus granted them an audience. His statement must not be conceived of as a repulse, but only as a declaration why His calling was more important to Him than His personal connections. It is, moreover, a most unnatural idea to suppose that His friends required to obtain special permission, if they wished to speak with Him at the close of His work of teaching. If those were free to come who wished to do so, how could it be that His nearest relations required any special liberty? It was natural, of course, that this opportunity would be used to discuss the matter which had made His mother and brothers anxious on His account, and doubtless they were easily convinced that there was no occasion for their interference, and that Jesus could not follow their well-intentioned counsel. Even Strauss is unprejudiced enough to admit that this scene does not show any estrangement between Jesus and His family; and that the supposition of His having from that moment destroyed every bond existing between them, is equally unworthy as untenable.

therefore represents Jesus as looking round upon those sitting about Him, and declaring that in contrast to them His true kindred were these disciples of His, so desirous of instruction, who accomplished the divine will by attending to His word (iii. 33 f.). It is only, however, the transference of this scene to a house (iii. 19) which has given rise to the conception of a reclining group of disciples, for in the oldest source He is surrounded by crowds of people. But apart from this, it is impossible to entertain the idea, for Jesus might describe individual persons as His brethren, but not as His mother, nor could He contrast them with blood relations, since, in order to enlarge the conception of relationship, He mentions sisters as well (who, according to the oldest account, were not present) that are only hinted at in Mark iii. 32, and no further mention is made of their presence. The first evangelist has incorporated this same antithesis from Mark, but he represents the disciples in the exacter sense as being described as Jesus' nearest kindred, and that on account of the divine sonship approved in their obedience, as is shown by the designation of God as His Father (Matt. xii. 49 f.).

A similar anecdote has been preserved by Luke out of his special source.[1] A woman from among the people gave expression in a genuinely womanly way to her half sensuous, half spiritual love for Jesus' human person, by declaring how blessed was the mother who had borne and the breast which had nourished Him. Even in this case Jesus felt Himself called upon to inform His auditors that true blessedness did not consist in any such corporeal connection with Him, but in the hearing and the keeping of God's word (Luke xi. 27 f.).

[1] From the fact that he connects this as distinctly with Jesus' defence as Mark did the scene with the friends, it is evident that he had met with it in the oldest source in connection with Luke xi. 14-26. But since he had already used viii. 19-21, he replaced it by this anecdote, just as the first evangelist replaced Matt. ix. 32-34 (Luke xi. 14 f.) by xii. 22-24 (comp. p. 283, note), and as he himself gave the son of the widow of Nain instead of the case of Jairus' daughter. This anecdote is certainly not a mere variation of the tradition of the scene with His friends, although we cannot know whether the parts which are almost literally the same as Luke viii. 21—which itself is not perfectly original—may not have been in some way modified. It is, of course, possible in itself that the arrival of His mother may have induced this exclamation on the woman's part, and that we have two different incidents connected with the one event; but this supposition is very improbable from the analogous turn in the statement of Jesus, and Luke's usual way of making use of his sources makes it quite unnecessary.

# CHAPTER VIII.

## RUPTURE WITH THE PHARISEES.

AMONG the various attempts made by His opponents to discredit Jesus with the people, was the propounding of all kinds of legal questions which might embarrass this pretender, and confirm the superiority of the scribes. It was plainly one of these disputed questions which was presented to Jesus by a lawyer belonging to the Pharisaic party, when he asked which was the greatest commandment in the law, *i.e.* by what token it was possible to distinguish the great from the minor commands (Matt. xxii. 35 f.). The Rabbinical schools were involved in endless disputes as to which commands were great and which small, and therefore there can have been no intention in this case to provoke Him to an answer which would put Him in their power. The explanation of the question being put at all was probably that they believed themselves able to demonstrate by all manner of examples and subtle arguments the inadequacy of any distinguishing characteristic He might give, and so be enabled to proclaim to the people that His acquaintance with the law was miserable, and that He was an uneducated teacher of it.[1]

Jesus' answer to this question has been greatly lauded, and with justice. But an attempt has been made to find in it a conception of a new ethical principle by which He transcended the teaching of the Old Testament law;

[1] The fact of the first evangelist introducing this scene into the last controversial address in Jerusalem, is explained by the action of Mark, who has again collected according to topical points of view any dialogues between Jesus and the different classes of opponents. But even Mark no longer perceived the seductive character of the question; he accepted it as a subject of theological dispute, in regard to which the scribe expected an appropriate answer from the Rabbi who had proved Himself to be so ready-witted; indeed, by anticipating a part of the response, he sharpens it into a question as to what commandment

it has even been said that He considered this to be the true object of His task; but this has little correspondence with the general declarations of Jesus regarding the law (comp. Book III. chaps. x. and xi.). He began by describing the verbally quoted commandment of love to God (Deut. vi. 5) as the great and therefore the first commandment (Matt. xxii. 37 f.). He certainly did not intend by this to say anything new, but only wished to describe the importance which was attributed to this commandment by the Old Testament itself, for this was indeed nothing else but a more minute amplification of the first command in the Decalogue (Deut. v. 7), which, because of the way in which it opens the great inculcation of all the "commandments, statutes, and laws" of Jehovah, is plainly intended to dominate them all. Mark quotes this "shema" more completely (xii. 29 f.), which is called by its introductory words, and is offered as a prayer by the Jews morning and evening; indeed, it was by reason of their interpretation of a passage in this law (Deut. vi. 8) that they bound their phylacteries upon their foreheads and arms. The exceeding importance of this command therefore could not but be acknowledged by His countrymen. What Jesus at first said was only that there was no necessity for indulging in subtle inquiries, or for defining by human wisdom which kind of commandments were great; that was plainly the great as well as the first one, which showed itself to be so, even when regarded in the light of its being such. The only thing new in all this is that He places alongside this command the injunction to love our neighbour, expressly said to be of equal importance, but which, although cited from the Old Testament, by no means occupies such a prominent position there (Num. xix. 18). He did not do so, however, in order to establish a difference between the great and minor commandments, for indirectly such a distinction is clearly rejected in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 19);

was "the first of all" (Mark xii. 28). The whole text of the first evangelist is undoubtedly original in contrast with that of Mark, and he must therefore have found another description of this narrative in his oldest source; and although Luke gives the question its only possible practical turn, according to Mark x. 17 he must have made use of such another description, for he mentions expressly that the question was put in order to tempt Jesus, and that it came from a lawyer (Luke x. 25).

but He justified it by the fact that on these two the whole law depends, both in its Mosaic foundation and its prophetical development (Matt. xxii. 39 f.), at least in so far as all the commandments are postulates of love to God and our neighbour. Jesus therefore repelled this foolish question of the schools in order to exhibit the harmony of the divine will, as it is revealed in the law, in contrast with the atomism of the scribes, which never got farther than reckoning, multiplying and balancing each separate command. Since each commandment is plainly the consequence of these two great ones, and these again are absolutely equal in importance, the whole difference between great and small commands has no meaning whatever, for that only leads to the depreciation of one portion of the divine will. The interests of the unity and sanctity of the whole law is so much affected by the energetic repulsion of this theory, that in proceeding to do so Jesus could not intend to supersede the law, but only to teach the true fulfilment of it, just as He did in the Sermon on the Mount.

The scribe's purpose was thus baffled, Jesus had approved Himself once more to be a master in the Scriptures; His plain decision, which was so apparent to the weakest understanding, must have interested the people far more than the misty statements of the scribes.[1] But the scribe, with his love of investigation, still fancied that he had discovered another difficulty in the Old Testament command to love (Lev. xix. 18), and therefore asked Jesus in addition what the law meant by the neighbour who was to be loved as

[1] Mark relates that the scribe praised Jesus' answer, and was therefore declared to be not far from the kingdom of God (xii. 32–34); but such an occurrence is only conceivable if it is also assumed, with Mark, that the question was not put in order to tempt Jesus (xii. 28; comp. *supra*). But this does not explain how the scribe could think of comparing religio-ethical duty with that of worship; for that Jesus' answer presented no opportunity, for there He treated of the law as a whole. In spite of all this, every analogy goes to show that this is no arbitrary addition made by the evangelist, with the purpose, as Keim supposes, of erecting monotheism and humanity into a symbol of union for the Jewish and Gentile Christians of his time. It seems to be a reminiscence of a totally different narrative, in which a scribe who had been really pleased with Jesus (as did indeed occur, comp. Matt. viii. 19) expressed his sympathy by the way in which he emphasized the command of love, especially as that was closely connected with the corruption of the law entertained by the prophets (comp. p. 166, note).

oneself (Luke x. 29). This question, however, was certainly not designed to tempt Him, for even the exposition of the law in the Sermon on the Mount had not attacked the letter of the commandment, nor prejudiced its meaning (comp. p. 153). It was very probably put by a well-intentioned scribe who, however much he might emphasize this command, still thought that, because of the very indefinite description of one's neighbour, it was very dubious when this commandment should be applied; and therefore that the particular directions as to its fulfilment, which were then promulgated by the scribes, presented great difficulties.[1] Only in this way can the minute and judicious character of Jesus' answer be understood. He recounted to the scribe the parable of the man who fell among robbers (Luke x. 30–35). The way in which the priest and the Levite mercilessly pass by the poor dying man forms a strong contrast to the compassionate Samaritan, who brings him on his own beast to the inn, cares for him, and when obliged to depart, provides that he shall afterwards be attended to. The national opposition between the Jew — here represented by the priesthood — and the

[1] The great difficulty offered by the circumstances in the narratives given in Matt. xxii. 35–40, Mark xii. 28–34, Luke x. 25–37, I have myself endeavoured to solve before this by assuming a continuation of the dialogue to have existed in the oldest source, which led on to the parable of the Good Samaritan. But the way in which Luke represents the scribe, after Jesus had pointed him to the law, as answering with a combination of the commandments of love to God and our neighbour (x. 26 f.), which, according to Matt. xxii. 29, was undoubtedly uttered by Jesus Himself, is historically inconceivable. The explanation seems to be, that in Luke's case there must be a mingling of two distinct narratives, in one of which Jesus completed this combination, while in the other the scribe declared his acquiescence in Jesus' preference for the command to love in order thereby to connect His question as to the meaning of the term neighbour. This interweaving, however, arose in the case of Luke because he assumed that the question as to highest commandment (the fulfilment of which secures eternal life), which is recorded in the first history, was only intended to tempt Jesus in so far as the lawyer thereby made this commandment a subject of discussion in order to connect with it the casuistic question as to the meaning of "neighbour." It is on this account that Luke describes the raising of this question as the scribe's justification for the first question which from his own declaration appears so unnecessary (x. 29). That he too knew of the first narrative, is the only explanation for the connection of love to God and love to our neighbour which has no meaning whatever for his representation, but suggests undoubtedly the text of the oldest source; from the way in which he passes by Mark xii. 28-34 with Luke xx. 39, it is evident that he was convinced he had already employed the narrative in chap. x.

Samaritan, was regarded in this case by Jesus as a type of that separating the most diverse conditions of men, just as in another connection He regarded the Pharisee and publican (comp. p. 133). It is hardly necessary to remark that the allegorical reference to Christ, which is discovered in the Good Samaritan by an artificial interpretation, has nothing to do with the meaning and intention of the parable. But neither is it a mere explanatory narrative intended to commend love to our enemies. Jesus Himself hinted at its meaning when He asked the scribe, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among robbers?" (x. 36 f.), so that the scribe answered that, of course, it was he who showed mercy. It is involved in this question that there is no need to inquire anxiously who is our neighbour, but we are to deserve the name of neighbour by our compassionate love towards those who require our aid. Self-evidently, indeed, it is a matter of no importance whatever whether the needy be our countryman or a foreigner, our friend or our enemy, our neighbour in the sense of the law or not. The priest and Levite stood apparently in a much closer relationship to the assaulted Jew, and yet he who became his friend was one of the despised enemies of the nation. Through the compassionate exercise of love one man becomes the neighbour of another; to act up to this is to fulfil the law which bids us love our neighbours. And from Jesus closing the conversation with the words, "Go thou and do likewise," it is apparent that in the original narrative the scribe had asked for an example of how this commandment was to be obeyed.

It is undoubtedly true that Luke represents the scribes of the Pharisaic party as importuning Jesus with their legal questions, and as pursuing under every circumstance their cunning aim of provoking by their wiles some declaration which would present occasion for a judicial prosecution (xi. 53 f.). It is in this sense that Mark describes the question put by the Pharisee, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" as being intended to tempt Jesus (x. 2). He certainly assumes, however, that it was a well-known fact that Jesus refused to recognise divorce,—a question in regard to which He had indirectly expressed Himself in the Sermon

on the Mount (Matt. v. 31 f.; comp. p. 150); on this occasion they hoped to find some ground for accusing Him of an open offence against the law by reason of some direct statement from Him.[1] With one of His inimitable touches Jesus asked His opponents, who, as He had probably remarked, expected certainly to hear some powerful expression of opinion against the statutes which Moses had commanded them to obey, what they had to say in regard to this matter. At this they imagined that they had gained their point when they were able to appeal to the fact that a letter of dismissal was expressly permitted by the law (Deut. xxiv. 1); but Jesus simply pointed out to them that the passage to which they referred had no bearing at all upon the permission they laid such emphasis on. Moses only made it legal out of regard for the hardness of their hearts, which led to separations taking place, but he did not thereby approve of divorce. On the contrary, Jesus directed attention to an actual command of this same Moses, but which is still more ancient, dating as it does from the commencement of creation, and from which, therefore, it must be possible to learn the motives of all later commands. He finds this commandment in the words of the primitive history (Gen. i. 27, ii. 24), where God is said to have created man differing in respect of sex, but expressly designed for wedded association; indeed, according to the meaning of the original text as that is apparent in the

[1] The theory is absolutely untenable which would make this an endeavour to provoke Jesus to the expression of an opinion regarding the marriage of Herodias, so as to prepare the way for Him suffering the same fate as the Baptist. Apart from all other considerations, there was no question whatever as to the illegality and immorality of that union in which there had not even been the appearance of formality. According to Mark x. 1, it is even doubtful whether this conversation took place within Herod's dominions. It is certainly impossible to ascertain the date of the occurrence, for Mark has manifestly arranged in that section a series of didactic talks according to topical points of view. The first evangelist has made the question refer to putting away a wife for any cause, *i.e.* as to whether Deut. xxiv. 1 was to be expounded according to the somewhat lax practice of the school of Hillel, or according to the stricter method of the school of Shammai, which only recognised divorce in the case of dissolute conduct on the wife's part (Matt. xix. 3). Even such a determined advocate of the originality of the first Gospel as Keim acknowledges that this view of the question is impracticable, for in that way it would no longer be a snare laid for Him; there was nothing hazardous for Jesus in siding with one side or another in this dispute of the schools.

Greek translation, Jesus expressly described it as two becoming one flesh. Since God Himself had ordained this union, no man dared put it asunder (Mark x. 3–9). It has been supposed that in this case at least Jesus went the length of direct opposition to Moses.[1] But all that He intended in this case, just as in the Sermon on the Mount, was to teach that the law of God as put into writing by Moses might be fulfilled in the sense of the supreme Lawgiver. This same meaning, however, He finds in the early Mosaic history, which in its account of the divine institution of marriage declares at the same time its indissolubility. If He had actually come "in order to gainsay Moses," the Pharisees would certainly have attained their purpose. But no one could say anything against Him when He explained Scripture by means of Scripture, and Moses by Moses. He made them observant of the fact that the indissolubility of marriage was the original will of God. That meant, therefore, that when Moses enacted the legal form of divorce, he neither approved nor permitted it, but only so far circumscribed the infringements of the perfect divine will, unavoidably occurring among a sinful people, as was absolutely necessary in order to avoid yet greater evils.[2]

[1] It is thought possible to prove from the course of the conversation in the first Gospel that Jesus was perhaps impelled by the Pharisees to this, since they opposed the passage from Deuteronomy to His argument from primitive history (Matt. xix. 4–7). But apart from the fact that Matthew's representation usually betrays itself to be a secondary redaction of the text of Mark, this was necessary for the first evangelist by reason of his putting of the question. For if the whole question turned upon the apprehension of the passage in Deuteronomy, Jesus could not begin by pointing to a Mosaic statute, which the Pharisees would suppose to mean Deut. xxiv. And besides, He could not possibly be induced by the Pharisees to begin by giving an opinion on this passage, for the whole kernel of the question consisted in the position which He took up towards it. It is only the first Gospel which represents Him as being induced to describe the passage from Deuteronomy as a permission for divorce, and as placing it in contrast to the regulation at the creation (Matt. xix. 8), which in Mark He expressly avoids doing.

[2] The remark as to remarriage (Matt. xix. 9) is, of course, out of place here. The first evangelist only annexed it to Jesus' speech because Mark, remembering accurately that it was spoken to His followers, puts it in this connection into a talk which Jesus had afterwards in the house with His disciples (Mark x. 10–12); it was originally uttered in the Sermon on the Mount. It is certain, however, that the application to the case of a woman dismissing her husband (ver. 12), which never occurred with the Jews, must have been made

The first evangelist has subjoined to this disputation a talk with the disciples, which gives one of the few sayings of Jesus he has preserved from oral tradition, but its figurative character is the guarantee of its originality (Matt. xix. 10–12). The disciples had thought that if this union was indissoluble, it was of necessity unadvisable to enter into it, for then a mistaken choice would make one miserable for life. With one of His fine ironical touches, Jesus admitted in a certain sense that there were circumstances in which it was not expedient to marry; but much depended upon the right understanding of this declaration. He certainly did not wish it to be apprehended as was done by the disciples. They shrank from the seriousness of the ethical task which is involved in marriage, and would therefore rather refrain altogether from undertaking the requisite duties, than present the sacrifice which could effect their deliverance. Jesus was very far from meaning this. He pointed out that there were men unfit for marriage by nature, as well as those who had made themselves so. It is possible, however, to make oneself incapable of marriage for the sake of the kingdom of God, by entering upon a calling which so engrosses the whole man that there is no room for the fulfilment of matrimonial duties. It is useless, in truth, for such men to marry, for they cannot meet the demands without dissipating their forces and interests, and ultimately neglecting the duties which this divinely-instituted state brings with it. It has been said, and not without reason, that Jesus Himself and the Baptist were eunuchs who had become so for the sake of the kingdom of God. But Jesus reminded His hearers once more that these words were not easy to comprehend. Marriage must not be regarded as unadvisable by reason of the comfort involved, or because of aversion to its serious tasks; neither, too, because of spiritual pride, which regards a self-chosen celibacy as something higher than the divinely-ordered condition of matrimony, or through the delusion that God's satisfaction may be earned by outward continence. The only reason for so regarding it must be zeal

by the evangelist in order to instruct his Roman readers as to this consequence of Jesus' statement. It is no less certain that the case in Matt. xix. 9, of a wife committing fornication, originated with the evangelist (comp. p. 150, note).

for serving the kingdom of God with all one's powers and with the entire existence. Although frequently discovered,—even indeed by Renan,—there is as little need for demonstrating that this declaration shows no trace of an Essene ideal of purity, which involved a renunciation of the world, as that it did not command self-mutilation.

The end of the constantly renewed attempts to make Jesus distrusted by the people, or to show Him to be culpable in regard to the law, was, that He was at last necessitated to come to a clear understanding with the Pharisees. He might postpone this momentous rupture so as not to oblige the people to decide between Him and these authorities before His own position was sufficiently secured; it was certain, however, to come some time, and the Gospels have preserved the account of what ultimately led to the rupture, as well as the words of Jesus which hastened it. It was no legal question which could induce Him to do this; for in so far as the scribes and Pharisees taught the law of Moses, He had taken their part (Matt. xxiii. 2 f.); He did not simply reject their pettiness and anxiety in fulfilling the same, but only required that the weightier matters be not forgotten thereby (xxiii. 23 f.). The open breach must have been produced by the question regarding His position to the traditions with which they had surrounded the law, and which, as the shibboleth of their party, they regarded as the principal matter. For these statutes, sacred as they were, and originating as they may have done in the time of Moses, were looked upon by Jesus as only human ordinances, and were rejected by Him out of regard for the law of God, which they put in the shade. No department of these ordinances, however, was so comprehensive, so confining to life on every side, as well as burdening the conscience with anxiety in following them, as those referring to purification. These observances certainly took their rise from the law itself. According to the Old Testament conception, uncleanness was caused by the mere touch of anything connected with the dead, with certain generic conditions, and with leprosy; *i.e.* there was thereby introduced a condition which was not in accordance with the consecrated position of the Israelitish people, and which could only be removed after a certain interval of time through the observance

of legally ordained practices of purification. It was also in thorough correspondence with the law, that one who had in this sense become Levitically unclean, made everything He touched in the same condition—men, table utensils, and couches (comp. Lev. xv.). It was involved in the nature of the case, however, that the application of these legal ordinances must be limited to the case where the ground for this defilement could really be recognised, if it were not to produce needless self-torture. That kind of thing would either lead to an over-appreciation of outward purity, which would be prejudicial to care for the inward, or else must have, as a necessary consequence of its actual impracticability, a gradually increasing indifference to the infringement of an ordinance which bore a religious significance. It was in this very sphere that these men of tradition, with their pretended strict observance of the law, thought to celebrate their highest triumphs. It was not for reasons of purity or decency, but in order to put a stop to every possible, if even unconscious defilement, that the distinct manner was prescribed in which the hands were to be washed before meat. On return from market, where there might without knowing it be pollution from contact with something which was unclean, a bath was commanded to be taken if possible; and where this could not be done, certain customs of sprinkling had to be observed before it was permissible to sit down to table. Over and above all this were the everlasting washings of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels which could in any way have been defiled by the touch of an unclean person, and the other endless statutes of a like character, just as Mark has described them (vii. 3 f.).

It was this disorder which Jesus opposed; He not only absolved Himself, but also His disciples, from the observance of these superlegal and traditionary regulations. His disciples were sometimes seen eating their simple meal without washing their hands (Mark vii. 2). This was the starting-point of the conflict. What might be forgiven in Himself alone, could not be suffered when He proceeded to form a school which refused to observe the prevailing customs; besides, it was this observance which was regarded as the way to the realization of that ideal which was intended to distinguish the people of God from the surrounding nations, by a sacredness, *i.e.* conse-

cration, which was carried out into the smallest details. That was the reason of the question, "Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders?" (vii. 5). The question was put by the Pharisees; but on this occasion, as once before, they were accompanied by some scribes who had come from Jerusalem (vii. 1; comp. iii. 22).[1] These respected teachers of the law were intended to oppose their authority to every attempt made by Jesus to dispute their justification for deducing their statutes from the law, for it was thought that they must know the rights of the question far better than a mere layman. Mark has no doubt whatever that Jesus used this opportunity for bringing about the rupture.[2] From the situation in which he places the whole occurrence (comp. vi. 53–56), as well as from the manner in which Jesus afterwards called the multitude to Him again (vii. 15), it is evident that we must not think of Him as having been surrounded by crowds; they would naturally give way, as the respected patrons of piety with the highly esteemed teachers of the law appeared to interview Him (vii. 1 f., 5).

Jesus paid no attention to their question, and this was what made His conduct upon this occasion so cutting. Besides, He directly characterized them as hypocrites before all the people, declaring Himself openly to be an opponent who will dishonour them in the eyes of the people, and will rob them of all their influence. This was something very different from His description in the Sermon on the Mount of a certain kind of piety which He denounced as hypocritical, without mentioning the Pharisees at all (Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16,

The sources present no traces whatever of any official deputation coming from the schools in Jerusalem, although this has been supposed to be one from the great Council. The scene without any addition is important enough, but that would have been to make it a State affair, involving complaint and condemnation, life and death, and as far as can be seen it was followed by no result. The break with the traditional statutes would make the Pharisees bitter enemies of Jesus, and on account of their influence with the people that was a fact of most momentous importance; but no sensible person can really suppose that there was in consequence a judicial accusation of Jesus to the Council, for the principal authorities—the Sadducean priesthood—themselves rejected these statutes.

[2] The time when this question was put cannot be decided with any degree of certainty. Mark places it after the feeding of the multitude, and there is much to be said for Jesus' adversaries choosing a time when His authority with the

vii. 5). However much His delineation might seem to point to them, it could only be said that He protested against certain excrescences connected with their party, which ultimately became general. But on this occasion He declared, without any circumlocution, that Isaiah had prophesied of the questions when he spoke of the people who honour Jehovah with their lips while their heart is far from Him, and whose worship is of no avail to secure divine satisfaction, because the doctrines by which it is regulated are only human precepts (Isa. xxix. 13). With these words from the ancient prophet Jesus presented the most striking characteristics of their piety, and He verified what He said by declaring that their zeal for the tradition of men was united with indifference for the law of God,—*that* they quietly left in order to hold fast to the other (Mark vii. 6–8). That zeal, therefore, was hypocritical which was pretendedly directed towards the accomplishment of the divine will, for this neglect of the divine law, in which alone that will was directly declared, showed that they were not interested in it, but in the traditions of men, which as a party they maintained; and therefore it was ultimately not God, but the party which was considered. This was no longer a criticism of some one fault, it was the condemnation of the whole system. Jesus rejected it as having only the appearance of holiness, and He refused to it any prospect of attaining divine satisfaction. It was on account of the sanctity of divine law that He broke with human tradition, for all experience teaches that not only does over-appreciation of the one lead to under-appreciation of the other, but that tradition

people had suffered its first severe shock by reason of the events connected with that event. We shall afterwards be convinced, however, that Mark's composition is in this section conditioned by a mistaken supposition which makes the chronological connection between this event and the feeding of the multitude most uncertain. The fact that only some of Jesus' disciples had been seen eating with unwashen hands (Mark vii. 2), while they usually took their meals in common with Him, seems to say that this observation was made while the disciples on their mission were journeying two and two through the length and breadth of the land. This difference in time, however, is very unimportant, for we have now almost reached the mission of the disciples, upon which events follow in rapid succession until the occasion of feeding the multitude. This only is certain, that Jesus would not bring about this rupture before He regarded His ministry in Galilee as concluded.

constantly asserts itself to be more and more in opposition to the divine law.[1]

It is involved in the nature of the case, that not only did Jesus make a declaration, but He also proceeded to enlarge and confirm what He had just said. Mark, however, gives us only one example by which Jesus showed how these human precepts not only abrogated the law of God theoretically, but also practically, by means of the tradition of the schools, which frequently far surpassed the traditions of the fathers (vii. 9). The Pharisees took a peculiar interest in everything required by temple service, and therefore also in the promotion of all kinds of pious foundations for the benefit of the temple. Such an institution was the Corban, or gift dedicated to the good of the temple. This was the foundation of the unprecedented precept, If a man say to his father or mother that the sum is *corban* which remains after his own needs have been supplied, and might reasonably then be applied to supporting them, it cannot be touched, for it is consecrated. Jesus proceeded to contrast that direction with the divine command of the old Decalogue, which was also acknowledged by the Pharisees, because it was delivered by Moses, "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Ex. xx. 12). He pointed out the terrible seriousness with which Moses describes as an unpardonable sin the slightest infraction of the honour there demanded, since it involves an insult to parents (Ex. xxi. 17). This He did in order that it might be fairly deduced what a terrible outrage against the law of God a precept is which deprives parents of the reverence a son ought to exhibit by supporting them. And yet this was not the solitary instance in which these precepts led to an open violation of God's law (Mark vii. 10–13). That was why Jesus condemned the whole character and conduct of the party as godless, and justified emancipation from the observance of their statutes.[2]

[1] It is perfectly incomprehensible how it could be supposed, in view of this statement, that Jesus made no distinction between Pharisaic precepts and the Levitical ordinances regarding purification, or that the consequences of the polemic extended purposely from the one to the other, and far beyond. Renan preferred to say that Jesus followed the tactics of all reformers by contrasting tradition with the text of Holy Scripture, to which, however, He could not Himself refer.

[2] It was the first evangelist who first made a connected speech from the two

It was necessary, however, that the people should know that this condemnation of the Pharisaic precepts did not mean that Jesus wished to undermine the law of God concerning clean and unclean. He therefore called the multitude in order to explain how this was to be regarded. Precisely because the people were not to draw any false conclusions from His opposition to their teachers of the law, Jesus explained how nothing going into the man from without could defile him, *i.e.* make him unclean in a legal sense, but only that which proceeded from him (Mark vii. 14 f.). The people perceived from this that He held fast the legal ordinance which makes a distinction between clean and unclean, and declares certain things to be polluting. But the law knew nothing of such a requirement as that enjoined by the Pharisees regarding the washing of hands before each meal, as if the unconscious and accidental touch of a hand which had come in contact with something impure could defile the food and render it unfit for man's enjoyment. The use of prohibited meats does not contaminate in the Levitical sense, but it is a most punishable transgression of the law. What really renders impure is that which proceeds from man—the various kinds of issues, the eruption of leprosy, and the corruption of a dead body. That Pharisaic ordinance is therefore perfectly illegal, and ought to be rejected at once.[1]

which Mark recorded, and in his account of the second represented the Pharisees' question as being answered by a counter one (Matt. xv. 3). In itself, however, it could not justify the transgressions of the disciples for the Pharisees to bring charges against them of worse offences. And besides this, His representation is plainly a secondary one (xv. 1–9). There is no longer any distinction drawn between the tradition of the fathers and that of the Pharisaic schools, although the two by no means amalgamated easily; here the decrees of the law are expressly described as the words of God, while Jesus really cited them as Mosaic, because the divine authority of Moses' commandments was never a subject of discussion between the Pharisees and Him. In Matthew the contested precept is so formulated that it interdicts the honouring of parents, although that was only proved by Jesus to be an indirect result, and could not possibly have been expressed so nakedly and daringly. The address effectively closes with that condemnatory passage from Isaiah, but only an unfounded preference for the first Gospel could blind one to the fact that this was the intention of the author.

[1] Jesus' intention cannot be more radically misunderstood than when it is said that He desired to appeal to the people in order to secure their support, and to

The general setting of Jesus' statement shows that it was connected with a profounder meaning, although an application to the case in point was permissible, even if it was far transcended. The disciples probably understood that it was of the nature of a parable; and when they were alone they asked as to its signification. Jesus was amazed that they had not understood, and blamed them for their want of capacity to do so; but because they did ask, He gave them the desired explanation (Mark vii. 17–23). As at other times in regard to the regulations of nature and of human existence, this legal order was made a pattern for the higher regulation which will define in the kingdom of God what truly defiles (*i.e.* morally) and what does not. Nothing coming from without can render a man unclean in this sense, but only the evil proceeding from him, because he is only stained in the eyes of God by the indications of a sinful will, and because, too, the incitation to evil, which comes from without, only defiles a man when he receives it into his will and allows himself to be seduced to sin. The way in which this thought appears to be carried out by Mark raises the suspicion that his purpose is literary, and the allegorizing application to the special case of unclean meats necessarily contracts the significance of a parable which in form seems to be comprehensive. This, however, does not make it impossible that even in this description Mark has preserved correct reminiscences of the words of Jesus, by which He guided His disciples to the full apprehension of His meaning. It is here pointed out that the meats which enter a man from without do not find their way into his heart, and therefore do not at all affect the part upon whose condition alone depends the estimation in which a man is held by God; they only affect the most subordinated portion of human organism. With that ironical touch of His, Jesus pointed out how the task of purifying meats from what is in any way unclean and cannot be assimilated, is undertaken by the process of digestion. With this is contrasted the heart, from which all evil thoughts proceed; for

make His doctrine the common property of all. It is perfectly evident that they could not understand this doctrine from His short utterances, whose parabolic meaning they could not fathom; and He was certainly by no means successful in "triumphing against the Pharisees" by their help.

even when such thoughts come upon a man from without, they are only evil when appropriated by the heart and made its own. The same thing is true also of the many sins of thought, word, and deed which defile a man, because their ultimate origin is in his heart.[1]

The multitude assuredly did not understand the meaning of this parabolic utterance, which even the disciples only suspected; but even so it was not without a significance for them, and it was that which Jesus had had in view. They knew now that His rupture with the Pharisees did not mean a rupture with the law, which these pretended to defend. Even the first evangelist thoroughly understood the significance of this scene. In an intercalation, which manifestly breaks the connection as given by Mark, he represents the disciples as drawing Jesus' attention to the serious offence which His conduct had given to the Pharisees. To that Jesus answered first of all with words which showed distinctly that He only rejected the Pharisaic precepts because they were the additions of men and not the commands of God (comp. p. 167). Then He proceeded to calm the anxiety of His disciples by characterizing the Pharisees, who only led the people astray by their mingling of both sets of statutes, in the words of the parable from the Sermon on the Mount (Luke vi. 39), as blind leaders of the blind, who along with these their leaders will fall into the pit (Matt. xv. 12–14). But this was certainly not the first occasion on which the Pharisees had been greatly offended. Ever since the controversy regarding the Sabbath, they had regarded Jesus as an offender against the law, who was worthy of death. This

[1] That the representation of the first evangelist is secondary in this regard also is plainly shown by the meaning of the parable, which was addressed to the people, being introduced into the body of the speech. It certainly makes the application apparent to the case in question, but obscures the approval therein given of the Old Testament regulations for purification, for what enters the mouth is contrasted with what proceeds from it, *i.e.* with the words; this is to limit the correct significance of the parable, and was in this case without any cause (Matt. xv. 10 f.). The meaning of it is therefore only a further carrying out of what had already been said to the people; and although the sins against the Decalogue are mentioned, which Mark gives, and that of false witness is expressly added, yet the enumeration far exceeds the category of sins of words which, according to the narrower interpretation of the parable, could alone fall to be considered (Matt. xv. 15–20).

scene had made no difference in the estimation in which they held Him. They had probably suspected long before what Jesus thought of them. But now that He had expressed Himself before the people, then they knew that there must be a struggle between Him and them, which must either end in His destruction or in the entire overthrow of their laboriously-acquired position with the people. Such a conflict they had long had in view, and they now desired His ruin with the ardour of rage which had been rekindled by this scene. Much had to be done, however, before their wish could be fulfilled; and at present they had nothing more definite to fasten upon than the disputed question of Sabbath observance.

# CHAPTER IX.

## THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE.

IT was about the beginning of March, in the year 29 A.D. that Jesus gathered His twelve disciples around Him, and said to them, "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He send forth labourers into His harvest."[1] The language in this case also is parabolic; for it can scarcely be the harvest, but the seed-time which is meant; and, indeed, the labourers could not be said to have been few hitherto, for there had only been one. But it is not an infrequent occurrence at the time of harvest, that the reapers are too few in number to overtake a heavy crop, and that other labourers have to be procured as quickly as possible, so that God's blessing upon the fields may not be lost; and so it was in this case. Jesus perceived that the time was come for the message concerning the kingdom of God, which He had hitherto proclaimed within a limited circle, being borne into a wider area. The more rapidly did He see the unavoidable crisis approaching, the more pressing did it seem to Him to send the glad tidings to those who had hitherto at best only heard of it through hearsay, so that the receptive from among them might not be awanting at the Great Day. This, however, He could not perform Himself. An unprejudiced ministry such as He had once upon a time begun among a limited number was now becoming daily more impossible, by reason of the constantly aggravated struggle with the Pharisees, who opposed His ministry everywhere, as well as by the growing excitement among the people, which

[1] The first evangelist uses these words as a superscription to his account of the sending forth of the disciples (Matt. ix. 37 f.), while according to Luke x. 2 they formed in the oldest source the commencement of the address of instruction delivered to the disciples who were about to go forth.

He was obliged to counteract by greater reserve on His part. The urgency of the task did not allow, however, of His accomplishing it by Himself traversing the country. The moment was come in which He required co-labourers, and it was for this moment that He had formed His band of disciples, and so far as possible prepared them for their duty (comp. p. 266). They were now to be His messengers. But although in choosing them He had destined them for this undertaking, it was God's concern for which they were to labour; God alone could make them able to undertake it. By requiring them to ask God for the true labourers who were so greatly needed, Jesus pointed out the right way for becoming themselves receptive for the operation of God's grace, which would make them capable for the accomplishment of their task.

The duplicate tradition of this introduction in the first and third Gospels shows indubitably that the oldest source contained a speech delivered by Jesus to the Twelve when sending them out on a special mission during His earthly life. It is a matter of dispute how far there was any historical preliminary, for in the speech itself it is distinctly stated what they were designed to do; but it is still possible to restore the address by a critical comparison of the accounts given in the first and third Gospels (Matt. x.; Luke x.). Mark, as was his custom, only gives a free version of some sentences from it, which seemed to him specially memorable (vi. 8–11); but, on the other hand, he puts the fact of their mission beyond all doubt by his exact account of their being sent forth, and of the way in which they executed their mission (vi. 7, 12 f.).[1] It is generally assumed, but incorrectly, that this was a trial mission intended to accustom

[1] Following Mark, Luke had already in chap. ix. 1-6 described the sending forth of the apostles, and the orders given to them. But in the section in which he followed the oldest source he met with the same address again, but in a much more detailed form; although in the source it was simply addressed to the disciples, he refers it to a greater company of seventy (x. 1); indeed, if its parabolic meaning is not recognised, the first words seem to assume that there were then co-labourers with Jesus, even if too few (x. 2). It cannot be doubted, however, that his source meant the more limited band of disciples, for from the same quarter Luke has preserved a word to the Twelve, which manifestly refers to x. 4 (xxii. 35). Apart from his great intercalation, wherever the first evangelist (see p. 310, note) deviates from the text of the

the disciples to the activity which was afterwards to be theirs, and to prepare them for it. But in sending them forth, Jesus thought as little as He had done in choosing them (comp. chap. vi.) of the ministry to which the apostles' duty would call them, and which would only take form according to the further development of circumstances, and certainly could have no particular resemblance to what they were charged with on this mission. The two harmonious accounts which we possess of their commission (Matt. x. 7; Luke x. 9) make it absolutely certain that the message which they carried upon this occasion concerned the approach of the kingdom of God. This indeed was the same announcement with which Jesus had Himself appeared (Mark i. 15); He now charged His disciples with it, for it was necessary to carry through the land the tidings of the salvation which had appeared. Mark mentions expressly that they preached repentance also (vi. 12), but indeed this call was always united with tidings of Jesus (Mark i. 15). In their own souls, earthly hopes, in the sense of the popular expectation, partly struggled with appreciation of the highest blessings which they had found in Jesus, and partly mingled obscurely with it, so that they were not in a position to give more particular instruction regarding the nature of the kingdom of God and the manner of its establishment. So much, however, they could proclaim with all gladness, for in spite of all that was still obscure and doubtful in respect of this near approach, they had attained to perfect certainty that the era of salvation had dawned along with the appearance of the Messiah, which must bring the realization of the kingdom of God and all the accompanying blessings of salvation, and in which no one could share without sincere repentance.[1]

oldest source, which in the main is accurately preserved in Luke x. 2–16, that is in a great measure owing to the respect paid to Mark's free version of some portions.

[1] It is therefore perfectly unhistorical to suppose that the disciples had already been commissioned to gather into a new community the receptive in Israel, or to proclaim the duties of the kingdom of God, which had already been established in the company of disciples. On the other hand, it is just as gratuitous to dispute the historicity of this mission of the disciples, because tradition supposes the later apostolic mission to have been established first by an express command from Jesus, and then through the prefiguration of such a trial mission during His lifetime; and not less so is it to regard the speech as

The disciples were certainly not instructed to proclaim this intelligence as Jesus, invested with divine authority, had Himself done; they were to act as His messengers, pointing the people to Him, and directing them to come as they were and become His disciples. The first evangelist had some reason for so representing it as if it was compassion with the multitudes, which were as sheep without a shepherd, that induced Jesus to send forth His disciples upon this mission (Matt. ix. 36). It is clear from both the versions which we possess of Jesus' speech upon that occasion, that at the beginning He thought of the people under the figure of a flock, which so frequently occurs in the Old Testament. Conformably to the word of Jeremiah (Jer. l. 6), that generation of the house of Israel appeared to Him like lost sheep (Matt. x. 6), because they had fallen victims to destruction on account of their sins. The reason for His disciples going forth, therefore, was to proclaim to them that Jesus was come to establish the kingdom of God, in which righteousness and salvation were to be realized in the midst of all the misery resulting from sin. Like the rams which lead the flock, they were to gather together the wandering sheep and bring them to Him—the true Shepherd, who would guide them to the fountain of salvation. Such leaders were sorely needed; for those who had hitherto given themselves out as such were not sheep of the flock, but, in the figurative words of the Sermon on the Mount, wolves in sheep's clothing (Matt. vii. 15), who would lead the sheep to ruin, if that would satisfy their love of dominion and their self-interest. It was among such wolves that He sent His disciples forth to act as true leaders and bring the herd to Him (Luke x. 3).

This of itself meant that they were not to go into any way

embracing several incidental commissions, addressed, it may be, to the disciples by twos. Mark's narrative, and through it the corresponding speech in the oldest source, gives sufficient security for this historicity of the mission of the disciples, which marks an important epoch in Jesus' ministry. It was through the intercalation of chap. x. 17–39, the elements of which we can prove belonged to quite different situations, that the first evangelist made the address into a prophecy of the subsequent apostolic mission, placing it in consequence of this supposition at the head of the section in which he describes the opposition which Jesus encountered. It was on this very account, however, that, apart from the ambiguous notice as to the sending forth of the Twelve (x. 1–5), he gives no more particulars as to the present mission.

of the Gentiles, or enter into any city of the Samaritans (Matt. x. 5).[1] Jesus had come to His own people, and this was a last endeavour to secure, if possible, wider acceptance among them; those whom He sent forth bore in their number the indication of their destination for the people of the twelve tribes, to whom His earthly ministry was directed, and to whom alone that ministry should be directed, which He now apportioned to the disciples. There is no necessity whatever for considering whether they would then have been fit to labour among Samaritans and Gentiles, or whether these were prepared for their message and reception of it. Jesus certainly said on one occasion, that what was holy was not to be given to the dogs, nor pearls to be cast before swine (Matt. vii. 6); an unauthorized proclamation would only injure the teachers, and not avail the hearers. But this was the very reason for the course taken by the history of salvation; it was a divine decree which pointed out the people of Israel as the sphere of their activity to Jesus and His co-workers.[2] Nothing is said of the particular places they are to go to; that would have required very minute directions. For the Holy Land was not without cities which were Gentile either in whole or part, and, besides, the direct road to many portions lay through Samaria. It is exceedingly probable, however, that Jesus wished, by this mission of the disciples, to bring

[1] According to this analysis, Matt. x. 5 f. followed in the original address upon Matt. ix. 37 f. (= Luke x. 2), and can still be traced in the commencement of x. 3, while after that came this verse. It is not to be wondered at that Matt. x. 5 f. is awanting in Luke; it was not so much because he feared a misinterpretation of the saying, which would apply it against Paul's mission to the Gentiles, but rather because he made the speech appeal to the seventy disciples to whom, according to x. 1, Jesus had already pointed out the places to which He desired to go, making such a direction impossible. On the other hand, the first evangelist has employed the expression in Luke x. 3 so as to connect with this address his great intercalation of the prophesied persecution of the disciples (Matt. x. 17–39). By so doing he had necessarily to make it appear that in their wanderings, like defenceless sheep among ravening wolves, they would be exposed to danger both of life and limb; and in this position they are recommended to conjoin the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of doves (Matt. x. 16). It is impossible, however, that this could be the original meaning of the expression, for in the actual situation when the speech was delivered, the disciples were threatened by no dangers whatever, and even on their return they had nothing to say of any hostility being shown them.

[2] We do not now so often hear it said that these words were added later by a Jewish-Christian hostile to Paul; there never was anything in actual history

His work in His own country to a conclusion, *i.e.* that it should remain confined to Galilee. From chronological data which will soon be evident to us, we have every reason for assuming that the time occupied by this missionary journey might be calculated by weeks; to scatter them through the whole country would have been very unlike the concentration which Jesus exercised in His own ministry.

Jesus' healing activity accompanied His message of salvation as a sign that the era of salvation was not far distant, and therefore His disciples were also to prepare the way to the hearts of men by their cures of the sick, thereby giving a pledge to the people of the appearance of divine grace (Luke x. 9). It seems to be expressly mentioned in the oldest source, that Jesus bestowed on them the power to heal the sick as an equipment for their calling (Matt. x. 1; comp. Luke ix. 1). To our knowledge, indeed, the disciples never made use of the only outward means which Jesus employed in effecting His cures (comp. p. 97); but in all probability they anointed the sick with oil (Mark vi. 13), which Jesus is never said to have done. On the other hand, we know that this custom, which the disciples seem early to have discontinued, was still observed in the apostolic age (Jas. v. 14). It is therefore certainly founded upon an admonition by Jesus.[1] Anointing with oil was customary at that time in con-

which could have led to such meaningless rudeness, or which even presented any occasion for it. It has certainly been asked ironically whether the disciples were at that date possessed of any such inclination to associate with Samaritans, or to enter upon a mission to the Gentiles, that Jesus was obliged to forbid them. But to say this is to overlook the fact, that if these words were to be a true guide for them, they are sorely lacking in the necessary distinctness, and especially in any positive contrast capable of being apprehended. Only through contrast are they intended to show that the great harvest field for which the disciples are to ask for right labourers is not Samaria and the land of the Gentiles, but their own nation, God's chosen people, whose necessities were clamant.

[1] It is perfectly wrong to assume that Jesus recommended any other methods of cure, or instructed them in any artifices by which He knew how to benefit by them, for we have seen that even Jesus' cures are by no means to be referred to Essene arts of healing. That bodily gift of healing which He possessed (comp. p. 96) was so grounded upon the spiritual and ethical conditions of His unique personality, that there could be no thought of the transference of it to others, nor of a natural disposition, as Weisse has supposed, occurring also in the disciples, the existence of which had led Jesus to select them. If anything analogous to this really occurred among the gifts of healing in the apostolic

nection with diseased limbs and open sores (comp. Luke x. 34), and even in the case of internal maladies; it is impossible, however, that Jesus can have recommended it to them as a medicinal cure of universal application which could effect the desired result in a natural way. The idea is absolutely untenable which supposes that this anointing with oil had a symbolic or didactic significance, or was an act of consecration, which had nothing whatever to do with the cure of disease. Jesus doubtless directed the disciples to employ this simplest of all means, and through prayer—which also accompanied the application at a later period (Jas. v. 14) —to implore God's blessing on the use of the same. This injunction of Jesus was the pledge that divine aid would not be denied to the prayer offered in full assurance of faith, in so far as the faith of the sick corresponded with it (comp. Matt. xvii. 16 f.). But precisely because this reciprocal faith was the condition of the miraculous cure, it appears to be indicated in the instructions to the disciples (Luke x. 9), as well as in the account of their successes (Mark vi. 13), that they were only able to cure in this way sickness of a comparatively mild description.

Jesus laid particular value upon expulsions of demons being the sign that the kingdom of God had appeared upon earth, and that a commencement had been made in the vanquishing of Satan's dominion; it was necessary, therefore, that His disciples should be accompanied by the same tokens when they proclaimed the approach of the kingdom. Not only in the statements in the first and third Gospels regarding their equipment, which presumably go back upon the oldest source (Matt. x. 1; Luke ix. 1), but also in Mark, is special prominence given to the fact that Jesus bestowed upon the disciples power over evil spirits (vi. 7; comp. iii. 15).[1] In this case it was really the power of the Divine Spirit which loosed the bands with which the superhuman power of the evil one held the demoniacs bound, just

age (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 9, 30), that rested upon their spiritual equipment, which at this date was not granted to the disciples.

[1] Mark only mentions their authorization for this; but that is not all that is involved by the manner in which He incidentally enlarges upon the expulsions of demons in the case of Jesus' ministry of healing alone (i. 39). We have seen already that, particularly in the oldest source, the expulsions of demons appear

as in the case of cures of the sick it was the divinely miraculous aid which accomplished the healing operation. But to speak the word which would give to each sufferer the assurance of deliverance, an express authorization was needed from Him who, in virtue of His mission, and in name of the Father, whose will was always known to Him, could utter it at any time (comp. p. 87). This had necessarily to be so when the assurance did not rest upon an unconditioned trust in God, such as the disciples could not possess without an equipment by the Spirit, and which in some cases, without the certainty of the divine will made known by the Spirit, might lead to a tempting of God. This was why, in sending them forth, Jesus had also to communicate to His disciples the authority to speak the word which would deliver such unfortunates as they might encounter; He did this in conformity with the will and counsel of the Father, without which He could not have sent them forth. The disciples, however, could only bid the devils depart in *His* name (Luke x. 17), for what they did according to His commission occurred as if it had been done by Him.[1]

In the speech at sending them forth, the first direction which Jesus gave the disciples was to take their departure without any great preparation. They had no need either of

as quite different acts of power from Jesus' ordinary cures of the sick, and it was therefore something very different for His disciples to anoint the sick with oil while invoking divine aid, and to command the evil spirit to go out.

[1] It is evident, from the way in which the disciples on their return rejoiced in their expulsions of demons as in peculiar successes (Luke x. 17–20), that they regarded them as differing from the cures which resulted from their anointing with oil; we must therefore conceive of them as being rare and extraordinary cases, while the cures formed part of their daily calling, just as in the case of Jesus Himself. That is why cures of the sick only are spoken of when Jesus describes the manner in which they are to open their ministry (Luke x. 9). In this connection, too, the instruction and healing would alone be mentioned, which the first evangelist puts at the commencement of the address (Matt. x. 7 f.), although even there, as we have seen, the purpose of their mission was fully set forth (Luke x. 3). The form, therefore, in which the cures they performed are more minutely described is undoubtedly due to the first evangelist; for this is the first time that expulsions of demons are put side by side with cures of the sick, and cures of lepers as well as the awakening from the dead from Matt. xi. 5 are here introduced, although the latter certainly did not form a part of Jesus' daily ministry (comp. Book III. chap. xii.), and would certainly, if they had ever occurred, have been mentioned by the disciples among their successes rather than the expulsions of demons.

purse or wallet, neither of any provision in the way of clothes, nor even of a pair of strong shoes, in case of their thin sandals wearing out (Luke x. 4; comp. xxii. 35). With their high calling in view, they were to learn not to burden themselves with anxiety about temporal matters, but to leave it to God to care for their bodily needs. Jesus knew that God would tender them whatever they required, through the love and gratitude of those to whom they were sent, and whose benefactors they were to be. In their association with Jesus, whose manner of life, if not exactly needy, was certainly unassuming, they had not learnt to crave for luxuries; and even if the necessaries of existence were lacking, they had learned to go without them, and even to deny themselves, as became disciples of their Master. These precepts have therefore a sound meaning, without its being necessary to seek in them, by means of a false spirituality, for directions for the way in which the disciples were to preach. Indeed, their preaching, plain and inartificial in character, needed no great preparation. Neither is it necessary to regard these injunctions as exhibiting an ascetic ideal for the disciples' subsequent apostolic mission, which is never so much as thought of in this address. Even Mark has not understood the directions in the apostolic source quite correctly, and depicts in his own vivid manner how Jesus bade them depart without any further preparation, but only staff in hand. Along with the prohibited wallet, which could also be put to other uses, he mentions food, and instead of the purse, he alludes to the money within it,—which Jesus had of course included, —saying expressly that not the smallest copper coin was to be put in the girdle, since this would be a contravention of the command. He closes by describing how they were to set out lightly clothed and shod, thus not only interdicting the carrying of a supply of wearing apparel,—which was what the source thought of,—but also the putting on of two coats, as is often done when going upon a journey (Mark vi. 8 f.). In this case, too, it is plain that all that was meant was that they were to set forth on their wandering with an unassuming bearing and confidence in God.[1]

[1] It was the later evangelists who first supposed, when Jesus mentioned the staff, that He only prohibited it in order to exclude the least of all the comforts

Jesus gave His disciples comprehensive directions as to the way in which they were to conduct their mission. It seemed to Him that these unlettered men, so little versed in the Scriptures, were not yet fit for rising in the synagogues as He loved to do, and that they were as little prepared for entering upon such a popular ministry as He exercised upon the sea-shore or mountain height. Nothing was left for them, then, but a house to house mission. By entering into family circles, they might learn how to proclaim the message with which they were charged, and when they had once secured a firm point of vantage, they could then seek to effect an extension of their activity. This is the only way in which to understand Jesus' direction to salute no man by the way, but to enter the first suitable house with their salutation of peace, which involved and introduced an offer of salvation. If there was any receptive soul, any child of salvation in the house, he would appropriate the salvation which they proclaimed, and even where their confident advance met with disappointment their labour would not be in vain; the blessing would return upon them, for the true work of any calling carries in itself a blessing for the workers. Even in such a case, however, they were calmly to claim hospitality; for the labourer, even where his work has met with no result, is worthy of his hire, which

which were generally taken upon a journey; this, however, gives an ascetic tinge to the preparations for the journey which is utterly opposed to Jesus' usual method. They overlooked what was purely descriptive in Mark's account, just as recent expounders have done, who see in it a mitigation introduced by Mark, or else that the original intention of Jesus was to permit the use of the staff. There is just as little cause for supposing that they were forbidden to carry with them a weapon of defence, because it was unsuitable for them as preachers of peace. In general, Luke (ix. 3) follows Mark closely, only giving a shorter enumeration of the prohibited articles, and mentioning the more valuable silver instead of the copper coins; the first evangelist differs from them both in enumerating the different kinds of money, and bearing in mind what was said in the oldest source, he prohibits the use of strong shoes, without exactly requiring them to set forth with their feet unprotected (Matt. x. 9 f.). It is not generally observed that he apprehends the purport and connection of these precepts as if they meant that these things were to be a kind of recompense for their labour (ver. 8). *This*, however much it might correspond with the circumstances of the evangelists, Jesus would certainly have hardly given. Therefore this evangelist anticipates in x. 10 what Luke in x. 7 undoubtedly gives in the original connection, that they would receive what was requisite for them as true labourers, although in this place it has no right meaning without some amplification.

here consists in provision for the day; they were not to go from house to house (Luke x. 4–7). The receptivity which was absent at first might possibly be awakened by a continuous ministry, and the looking for a new lodging in which the entertainment would be better in every way could not correspond with the unassumingness which Jesus required from His disciples, nor would it show gratitude for what was offered them in the first house; and besides, such conduct could only offend the inmates and steel them against the disciples' ministry. Wherever in a city they found hospitable reception, which was certainly the first condition of their ministry, they were to accept the same, and then to cure and to preach. But wherever the simplest hospitality was refused them, they were not to continue their attempts at conversion there, but were to regard this conduct as a token that the receptivity was lacking, without which their labour must be necessarily ineffectual. Indeed, they were to tell the inhabitants of the place plainly that they would have nothing to do with them, and then, shaking the dust from their feet, to pass from thence and direct the blessing of their activity to more receptive quarters (Luke x. 8–11).[1]

Even then, therefore, Jesus assumed the possibility that in some places His disciples and messengers would be refused ordinary hospitality, and that the blessing which was intended for all would be held as valueless. But even here there is no

[1] The instruction to salute no man by the way (x. 4) cannot possibly mean that salutations were not to cause them to tarry; it must be explained by means of contrast. The reference to the hospitality of the houses and cities in which they laboured (x. 7 f.) has as little to do with a polemic against Levitical scruples about food, as the shaking of the dust from their feet (ver. 11) is concerned with a declaration of defilement. Mark only communicates two precepts from this connected address (vi. 10 f.), which in their separate condition no longer exhibit clearly their motive and tendency. In his repetition of these the first evangelist was led to imagine (Matt. x. 11–14) that the disciples were to choose the most worthy house for taking up their abode, after the most careful inquiry; such action, however, was plainly impracticable, even the speech itself shows that it would have been no security against deception. He also imagined that the test of the receptivity of any town was its bearing towards their preaching; that would have necessitated continuous attempts, while the indispensable degree of receptivity was really tested by an outward token. Even the shaking of the dust from their feet might mean to them in symbolic language that they were not worth further trouble, but as a symbolical action it could not be comprehensible by the townsmen.

mention of inimical threatenings, but of a previous prejudice which prevented a friendly reception. It is perfectly evident that Jesus feared such conduct as the result of the influence exercised in some quarters by His opponents, and therefore there is no reason whatever for supposing that if they were originally in this connection, these words prognosticated sad experiences and grievous afflictions. What Jesus really said was, that the punishment for such non-receptivity would be greater at the final judgment than the punishment of those who perished in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah (Luke x. 12). For however great were the sins of these cities, far greater was the guilt of those who rejected the salvation proclaimed in the disciples' intelligence of the kingdom of God.

It was now that Jesus, with a bitter retrospective glance at His ministry up to that time, summed up its results in the cities which He had most frequently visited. Had these shown themselves receptive? He had met with admiration, and many of their inhabitants believed themselves to be His most devoted adherents; but He could not perceive in them the evidences of true conversion. And yet He thought that the mighty works they had witnessed, which were the credentials of His divine mission, were sufficiently great to have secured attention to His preaching of repentance, and to have produced a result even in such cities of debased heathendom as Tyre and Sidon. That was the reason why He lamented over cities, such as Chorazin and Bethsaida, which would have more to answer for at the judgment than Tyre and Sidon (Luke x. 13 f.). Nothing is intended to be said here of a hope that the Gentiles would one day show themselves more ready to receive the gospel than His own people. Gentile cities, like Sodom and Gomorrah, with their abominable sins, were to Jesus only types of depraved beings, who, if they had possessed such an incentive to repentance as those cities had had, would probably have shown themselves more penitent; because their lot had been different, a milder judgment was in store for them. More than any other town, Jesus interested Himself in Capernaum; this town, which He had so preferred as to make it the centre for His ministry, He threatened by a reference to a passage in the prophets (Isa. xiv. 13, 15),

declaring that as it was exalted to heaven through this preference, it should be brought down to Hades by the terrible punishment which would be executed over it as an unrepentant city (Luke x. 15). This affecting glance at the results of His ministry is only apparently disjoined from the connection of the speech by the form of the rhetorical apostrophe, betraying Jesus' profound agitation. It shows indubitably that the address, and therefore the mission of the Twelve, on which occasion it was spoken, occurred at a period when Jesus regarded this ministry as practically closed.[1] We see from this that Jesus did not regard non-receptivity towards the preaching of His disciples as less culpable than that towards His own preaching of repentance.

But the speech was not to close with this menace of punishment; it ended with a promise to those who showed their receptivity by receiving the disciples. If they who did not welcome them were to be treated like those who remained unrepentant, notwithstanding the ministry of Jesus, the very opposite would be the case with those who did admit them; they would be looked upon as having received *Him*, only because these disciples came in His name. Jesus showed what this meant, by saying that in His person God Himself was received (Matt. x. 40). It is also said that they shall obtain what those do who receive God's highest ambassadors. But both these denunciations over the scenes of His activity were intended to strengthen the menace of punishment against those cities which would not receive the disciples. In the same way Jesus strengthened the promise of reward, which was involved in this statement, by two analogous

[1] This was what induced Luke to put this speech, which begins a considerable intercalation from the oldest source, at the head of the section where, according to the design of his Gospel, the description of Jesus' wandering life beyond Galilee is given. He is certainly wrong in assuming that the sequence of the parts in that source was entirely chronological. By reason of his method of composition, the first evangelist, in his version of the speech, replaces this portion by the great intercalation connected with x. 16, although in x. 15 he has preserved the beginning of it (comp. Luke x. 12). Expressly saying that these words were spoken at the same time (comp. Matt. xi. 1, 20), he gives xi. 21–24 as the account of an independent survey which Jesus made of His ministry, in which x. 15 reappears as a parallel announcement of punishment along with xi. 22, and the address to the disciples is curiously united with a rhetorical apostrophe to the town.

examples of the bestowal of divine recompense. Both of them teach that the divine reward is not calculated by the measure of performance, but by the fulfilment of duty which varies according to position and calling, and according to the degree of those very diverse actions may meet with the same reward. It is not every one who can be a prophet like the mighty ambassadors of the Old Covenant; but it is required of each one that he receive a prophet as what he is, namely, as one sent to announce the will of God. Whoever therefore receives a prophet, not because pleasing to him personally or from any other considerations, but from regard to the name he bears, *i.e.* for the sake of his divine calling, has fulfilled all that is demanded from his position, and will earn such a reward as a prophet receives. The greatness of the recompense to that prophet who overtakes the duties of his profession, has already been mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 12). A just man, *i.e.* one who perfectly fulfils the will of God, every one must of necessity be; but not all are so successful in realizing this ideal as the mighty men of God who lived in Old Testament days. But whoever receives a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, *i.e.* because he is what his name implies, shows, from the fact of his exhibiting service and love for its sake, that the fulfilment of the divine will is to him of great importance, and he will therefore receive such a reward as a righteous man receives. There cannot be such esteem without a corresponding striving towards the same goal, and this is rewarded by God apart from the degree in which the goal is attained (Matt. x. 41). It is true that there were no longer prophets and righteous men as in the days of old, but there was One in whom the character of a prophet and righteous man was completely realized—the last of God's great ambassadors, who not only gave a perfect revelation of the divine will, but fulfilled it to the full. Whoever received Him simply as what He was would secure no less reward than what He Himself expected from His Father in heaven. This was precisely what His disciples had done, who now took their departure in His name. They were certainly not mighty men like the prophets and saints of the Old Testament, but in the eyes of the world simple, unassuming people. But

whoever received one of these little ones in the name of a disciple, *i.e.* both because he called himself a follower of Jesus, and for the sake of the calling to which Jesus summoned him, whoever, indeed, should render him the smallest service in this sense, Jesus promised him with renewed solemnity that he should not miss the reward of a disciple (Matt. x. 42).[1]

After receiving the commands of their Master, the disciples set forth two and two, as Mark expressly mentions (vi. 7). This fact is indubitable, for even the first evangelist in his account takes occasion to reckon them by twos (Matt. x. 2–4). We learn from the Gospels also, that even on less important occasions Jesus sent them forth in couples (Mark xi. 1, xiv. 13). He evidently tried to accustom them early to act in brotherly unity, and to give each other mutual counsel and assistance; He wished to lighten the task of the individual, besides adding to the duties of their calling a special duty required by affection. Jesus Himself was now for the first time in His public life alone, quite alone. For it is clear from this sending the disciples forth in pairs, that even those who had hitherto been His most inseparable companions were not left behind. We are impelled to ask where Jesus stayed, and what He undertook when His disciples departed; and we find the answer in the Fourth Gospel, although it says nothing either of the mission or of the Galilean ministry whose close it formed. It tells, however, of a journey, breaking in upon the Galilean ministry, which Jesus took to Jerusalem, and which, according to the most palpable view of the description, probably took place shortly before the final decision. We have seen already that the feast which Jesus then attended can only have been that of Purim (vol. i. p. 391); and since it was solemnized on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar, we must place the mission of the disciples in the first half of the month of March, if it was then that

[1] The fact that the giving of a cup of cold water is here mentioned as the pledge for the reception of a disciple, shows manifestly that hospitable reception was to be the test of the receptivity of their countrymen. All this really meant that Jesus would regard the reception of His disciples as if He had experienced it. Luke has only preserved a tiny remnant of this closing promise (x. 16), probably because it seemed to be hardly comprehensible for his Gentile-Christian readers; Mark ix. 37, 41 exhibits reminiscences of the same.

Jesus went alone to Jerusalem. This, however, is exceedingly probable, for the disciples are never once mentioned in what John tells of the events at this feast.[1]

These very events show us for what purpose Jesus journeyed to Jerusalem. It was certainly not the feast alone which explained His doing so, and if His stay in Jerusalem was to cover the period occupied by the mission of His disciples, it must certainly have lasted longer than the feast days proper. The question, therefore, is perfectly unimportant, whether according to the Jewish calendar of that time the feast could fall upon a Sabbath. When His ministry in His native province was practically concluded, and the fact had become known, Jesus would be obliged to obtain certain information as to the position which the authorities in Jerusalem would take up towards it. He probably suspected how it would ultimately turn out; and it is therefore only a token of His tender consideration for the disciples, and His affectionate sparing of them, if He wished to spare them the disheartening impression of His visit there. It was quite different to tell them about it and to make them eye-witnesses.

This was why, in the year 29 A.D., Jesus travelled alone to Jerusalem to attend the feast of Purim.

[1] Even the way in which these events are narrated tells in favour of this view. Nowhere in the Fourth Gospel is the vividness of an eye-witness so lacking as in this section. The narrative of a cure, with which it begins, has certainly an intense local colouring, as could not be wanting if Jesus Himself narrated it; but in its further course it lacks all the characteristic details which eye-witnesses generally introduce, and it is manifestly drawn up after the pattern of similar narratives of occurrences on Galilean ground (John v. 8 f.). The remembrance of what brought about the most important transactions of that date has been correctly preserved, according to Jesus' communications, but the narrator clearly unites it with similar Galilean incidents (John v. 16–18), although the situation was a characteristically dissimilar one. Those transactions themselves, however, although manifestly connected with very various centres, are given in the form of a continuous address. And this speech, although it distinctly preserves the recollection of what Jesus said of these occurrences, frequently disposes of the statement according to didactic points of view, and may be said to be given in more Johannine language than usual. To us these reminiscences are invaluable; but although they represent these transactions so vividly, it is evident that the evangelist was not himself an ear-witness, but only gathered together in one large connected picture the accounts which Jesus gave of the principal points.

# CHAPTER X.

## RUPTURE WITH THE HIERARCHY.

THERE was a pool in Jerusalem, called the sheep pool, in the centre of which bubbled a fountain with curative properties. The spring was an intermittent one, for the waters only gushed forth periodically, and the pool was only curative while they did so; when the bubbling ceased, the waters were rapidly mingled together.[1] For the protection of the sick who constantly gathered about this healing spring, a pentagon of covered porticoes was built round it; this hospital was named "Bethesda," or, the house of mercy (John v. 2 f.), and had probably been erected as a pious institution. We do not know what led Jesus to this place; but it seems from His appearance there that even in Jerusalem He made the healing of the sick His daily task, and on that account sought out this abode of suffering. He found there a man who, as the result of a life of sin, had been paralyzed in all his limbs for thirty-eight years. He had got himself borne thither on his couch, but had never succeeded in being able to make use of the waters. But precisely because he could still assist himself when compelled to do so, he was obliged to descend into the pool unaided; but as he could only move slowly and with great difficulty, others always came before him, causing him to arrive too late to make any use of the healing flow. The sufferer did not know Jesus, and therefore could not appeal to Him with a confident prayer for healing;

[1] We are aware of a fountain of the Virgin in Jerusalem which seems to be intermittent; but it can scarcely be identical with the medicinal fountain of the sheep pool, whose situation cannot yet be pointed out with any degree of certainty. The pious popular belief explained the setting in of the curative gushing by the descent of an angel from time to time, who came to move the waters; but the Fourth Gospel does not contain the explanation, for the words which do express it are, according to the oldest account of our text, an undoubtedly later addition.

but when Jesus heard of his fate, He turned to him with the question, "Wouldest thou be made whole?" This was done in order to rouse a hope in the man that one was present who was able to help him, and while commanding him to rise, take up his bed and walk, Jesus did heal him (John v. 5–9).[1]

This event, which was far from being extraordinary in the life of Jesus, was to have the most momentous consequences. It was on a Sabbath that Jesus cured this sufferer, and bade him carry home his bed. Some members of the Sanhedrim who were present called the man to account for this act of desecration, for the bearing of a burden on the Sabbath was so regarded (comp. Jer. xvii. 2 f.). The accused naturally appealed to the man who had made him well, for in his eyes the power of effecting this miraculous cure involved also the authority necessary for commanding him to perform these acts; but he could not specify more particularly who the man was. Here, as in

[1] This narrative is guaranteed by its connection with a definite locality, and by the details mentioned respecting the man who was cured, as well as by the results which followed. Suspicions in regard to it were first raised by expounders like Hengstenberg, who saw in the sick man a type of the people of Israel, and interpreted the thirty-eight years to mean the years spent in the desert. The older Rationalism supposed that the case was that of a beggar feigning illness, whom Jesus unmasked with His authoritative words. Modern criticism has endeavoured to show the improbability of the narrative by declaring that, according to the plain meaning of the statement, the man had lain for thirty years beside the pool. It is amazed at the incredible uncharitableness which desisted from carrying the sufferer down to the pool, at the initiative taken by Jesus, or at the fact of the sick man not addressing Him; while the truth is that all this is explained by the situation; indeed, the whole narrative has been regarded by criticism as a mere remodelling of the synoptic account of the cure of the paralytic (Mark ii. 1–12). It is certainly undeniable that the close of the narrative, more especially (ver. 8 f.), does put one in mind of Mark's story (Mark ii. 11 f.); but this is because Jesus, who regarded the whole incident as important only from its being the cause of the events which followed, did not communicate the particulars, and therefore the evangelist represented it according to the manner of similar cures. There can be no thought of a remodelling guided by tendency, for the evangelist had no need for employing anything of the kind, and besides, the miracle is not enhanced by the man being paralyzed for thirty-eight years, and by the cure taking place in this "great theatre of sickness," particularly as the sick man had not once had an opportunity for testing the efficacy of the healing fountain, —there is no mention in the original text of an angel's action. In general, however, Jesus would cure similar complaints in a similar way, and it cannot be surprising that like suffering was in this case also the consequence of a life of sin (John v. 14).

Galilee, Jesus had no wish to cause any excitement by His miracles of healing, and since so many people were gathered together in the porticoes, He had quitted the place immediately after effecting the cure; thus making it impossible for the man to learn who his benefactor had been. Not long afterwards, however, on entering the temple to thank God for his recovery, he met Jesus, who seized the opportunity to admonish him not to bring upon himself afresh the punishment of God by a relapse into his former sinful courses, for the second punishment would be worse than the first. We perceive from this that Jesus was not only concerned about the cure of the body, but that He endeavoured through it to bring the man to thorough repentance. On this occasion, of course, it would be easy to learn Jesus' name; and the fact of the man now proceeding to the hierarchy in order to let them know, neither shows particular gratitude on his part, nor defiance of the authorities, nor even any malicious spitefulness. He only acted so in order to justify himself, for he had been accused of Sabbath-breaking, and it seemed to him even then that the authority of the great worker of miracles was sufficient to screen him (John v. 10–15). This, indeed, must have been acknowledged in a certain sense by His accusers, for nothing is afterwards said of their persecuting the man who was cured, all their attention was directed to Jesus.

This was the commencement of the conflict between Jesus and the hierarchy. There is no foundation whatever for supposing that it was anticipated by the fourth evangelist. Long before this, Galilee had seen the beginning of the dispute concerning Sabbath observance, which had at last produced deadly enmity against Jesus (Mark iii. 6; comp. chap. iv.). There it was a simple question regarding Jesus' position to the Pharisaic party; here, however, He was in direct opposition to the ecclesiastical heads. The way in which the dispute broke forth did not differ essentially in the two cases. The question between Jesus and the Pharisaic guardians of the law concerned the proper manner of observing it, and that was a subject in dispute between the various schools of lawyers; it was quite possible that He might be in their eyes an offender against the law, who was

deserving of death, without their being able to reach Him judicially in any way. In this case, however, He had presumed to prompt one of His countrymen to break the Sabbath under circumstances which induced the man who was cured to appeal to His authority in opposition to his lawful superiors. From their standpoint that was an encroachment on their sacred rights, and in regard to a matter in which, judging from the letter of the law, right was upon their side ; it was an open attack upon the legal observance of the Sabbath, for He not only trangressed it Himself, but actually seemed to consider the law itself unnecessary.[1] Even the manner in which Jesus accepted the challenge was quite different in the present case. With the scribes and Pharisees, who had only arrogated to themselves the right of deciding what was the correct fulfilment of this law, He could dispute the question as much as He pleased; but in opposition to the highest authority in Israel, to whom belonged the regular decision in regard to such matters, He could not rest the right to do as He had done simply upon His different conception of the meaning of the law ; He was obliged to give a profounder reason.

It must be a correct reminiscence, then, that John has preserved, when he says that this dispute was at once narrowed to the question regarding His unique relation to God, upon which Jesus rested His independence of every human authority. This connection He Himself described as one of affection, in virtue of which the Father showed Him all that He did ; Jesus was therefore always possessed of a clear consciousness of the divine action, which to Him, as the Son, had a typical value (comp. Matt. v. 45), and was therefore a constant revelation of the divine will. Nothing is said

[1] We have observed already that the evangelist, who had not himself been an eye-witness of the events, does not clearly distinguish the real motive of the Sabbath dispute in Jerusalem from the similar dispute in Galilee (comp. p. 32, note). On this occasion he represents Jesus as saying something in defence of His observance of the Sabbath (John v. 17 ; comp. p. 169), while really this cure, which had resulted from a mere word, presented no occasion for so doing. But not only does John refrain from pursuing this question farther, but his positive statements regarding the reason of the deadly enmity of the hierarchy involve far more than this ; they indicate that Jesus not only broke the Sabbath in isolated cases, but that through the way in which He authorized others to do the same He had called in question the real validity of the Sabbath law (v. 16, 18).

here of visions or of special heights in His inward life, but of a constant and immediate knowledge of His Father's will, which was the pattern for His own action, and made Him independent of human authority, because it was rooted in the peculiar character of His religious life. He declares, however, that there is a contradiction in upbraiding Him with laying claim to such a unique connection with God, and at the same time with infringement of the divine law, for the one was plainly excluded by the other. Precisely because He is a son in this unique sense, the constant fulfilment of the divine will is intrinsically necessary for Him, and any infringement of it an ethical impossibility (John v. 19 f., 30). We here get a glimpse into Jesus' unique consciousness of Sonship, which, however certainly it was founded upon an eternal election (vol. i. p. 305; vol. ii. p. 74), did not transcend in its expressions what was involved by the peculiar character of His religio-ethical life.[1]

Undoubtedly from their point of view the hierarchy could only see the greatest arrogance in this appeal to His consciousness of Sonship (John v. 18). It was therefore necessary for Jesus to confirm the claim by pointing to the unique character of His calling, which only one who was in the highest sense Son of God could be required to undertake, *i.e.* to His Messianic calling, in virtue of which He could indeed assert His authority over all authorities. He had certainly arrived at consciousness of being the Messiah from knowledge of Sonship (comp. vol. i. p. 303, note), and it was therefore only possible for Him to attest His appeal to the latter if He had a right to lay claim to the Messianic calling. For only he could be destined for this high calling who as the Chosen of divine love could boast of the most perfect

[1] By reason of his more profound perception of Christ's nature, the evangelist sees in this an equalization with God (John v. 18). But it is this very passage which most clearly shows how thoroughly mistaken criticism is when it discovers in the following address a series of developments of the doctrine of the Logos, in which the evangelist represents the divine nature and action of the only-begotten Son, as well as gives His description of the absolutely divine character of this miracle of healing. This speech has certainly little general reference to this miracle of healing, nor is it possible to find any statements as to the metaphysical unity and equality of the Son with the Father, although current apologetics believes it has succeeded in doing so.

intimacy with God, and of a continual accomplishment of the divine will, which secured Him in God's perpetual satisfaction and unclouded love. It is true that even in this case Jesus is not directly proclaimed Messiah; He does not claim a title which, apprehended in a revolutionary sense, might have given the hierarchy a most convenient excuse for denouncing Him to the Roman authority as a rebel.[1] In His Galilean ministry He had only indirectly proclaimed Himself the Messiah, by asserting Himself to be the Son of man, who was to bring about the consummation of the theocracy in the approaching kingdom of God. And to the spiritual rulers of Israel He would certainly represent Himself as the chosen Son of God, by pointing out that powers had been bestowed upon Him which were only suitable for the Messiah when re-establishing the theocracy. It is not absolutely improbable that Jesus described the promised and expected resuscitation of the nation, without which there could be no consummation of the theocracy, in an Old Testament figure (comp. Ezek. xxxvii.), as the reanimation of dry bones and the awakening of a great field of the dead. On the other hand, when He refused to acknowledge the supreme authorities in the present theocracy, He could only do so by asserting Himself in opposition to them as the supreme juridical appeal in the coming era of consummation, which would decide on who were to share in the consummation of salvation which began at the same time. It is true that with regard to these pretensions the future only could decide. But even then He was able to point out that a spiritually reanimating influence proceeded from Him, which must bring about a crisis in the nation that would itself decide who were to participate in the blessings of the perfected theocracy. We gather from the synoptic tradition as well (Matt. viii. 22; Luke xv. 24, 32) that Jesus loved to describe His religio-ethical ministry as an awakening to newness of life; and we have already heard from His address on sending forth the disciples, that He

[1] From the circumstance that the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus, when near the close of His ministry, as being called on by the hierarchy to declare candidly His position in regard to the Messianic question (x. 24), it is clearly evident that even the fourth evangelist did not assume this throughout, as criticism loves to represent.

regarded the way in which His ministry and that of His disciples was received as involving the most serious consequences (comp. Mark iv. 11 f.).[1]

This reference to a spiritual ministry, which the hierarchy was by no means inclined to acknowledge, at least in its true significance, would certainly not satisfy them; proceeding from their standpoint, it was necessary to demand far more comprehensible guarantees for His assertion that Messianic authority had been bestowed on Him. In the account of the question as to authority which the hierarchy put to Jesus (Mark xi. 27–33), the older tradition preserves a distinct reminiscence of this demand having been made.[2] It was impossible, however, to give a simple answer to this question. That God alone could bestow this Messianic power was self-evident, and therefore it could only mean how this investiture had been effectuated by the authority of God

[1] This is manifestly the historical foundation for the portion of a speech in John v. 21–30 which is certainly given in a somewhat abstract and didactic way. It verifies the general truth, that to the Son is delegated the duties of judging and of making alive (vv. 21–23), first by the actual exercise of this authority (vv. 24–27), and then by going on to promise the final accomplishment of these works (vv. 28–30). It is therefore perfectly evident that the raising of the dead, of which Jesus spoke figuratively, the evangelist supposed to mean the Messianic resurrection that was expected to take place at the last day. Into what Jesus said of the new life created through His influence, it is clear that the evangelist superinduced his own conception of the eternal life possessed by the believer in this world. And so, too, it is the evangelist himself who reflects that a God-equal honour of the Son is intended by the transference of these specifically divine works (v. 23), and that the communication of eternal life from Him presupposes an original communication of the same to Him (v. 26); but all through we can see clearly the fundamental thoughts of the speech, or rather the occurrences which led to their being expressed.

[2] It is not surprising that this is placed during Jesus' last stay in Jerusalem, for these evangelists only tell of this one visit, and are therefore obliged to transfer to it everything which must have taken place in Jerusalem. We have already seen on the occasion of the purification of the temple, when alone the question could have been raised as to the power through which Jesus acted (comp. p. 10 f.), that two distinct events have been mingled in the account (Mark xi. 28). In this case, however, as the course of the dialogue shows, it was undoubtedly the Messianic authority which was in question, and it was on the occasion of this visit to the feast that Jesus had first claimed it in opposition to the hierarchy. At the time of His last visit there was no doubt whatever as to His Messianic claims, and they had frequently formed a subject of discussion between His opponents and Himself. The question was now put to Him: From whom had He received this authority to which He laid claim?

which they themselves recognised. Anything of this kind was foreign to the usual course of things in Israel, where the Sanhedrin formed the supreme authority; God must therefore have sent in an extraordinary way a prophet to bestow legitimation upon Jesus, if it was possible for Him to answer the question of the hierarchy; and that was what God had done. It was doubtful whether they had recognised John the Baptist as such a prophet, and that was the reason why Jesus asked them as a preliminary whether the baptism which John preached was from heaven or of men, *i.e.* whether they acknowledged the Baptist's divine mission or not. The very fact of Jesus being able to do this shows distinctly that the hierarchy had taken up no distinct position towards the Baptist. They had neither instituted legal proceedings against him as a false prophet, nor had they recognised his prophetical mission by submitting themselves to his baptism of repentance. They were therefore unable to give any definite reply. For if they pronounced in favour of his divine mission, Jesus might ask why they had not received the divine message he delivered, and in view of the coming judgment which he proclaimed, had not endeavoured to escape it in the way he pointed out by divine command. And yet more. It can scarcely have been unknown to them that the Baptist, even if only to a limited number of hearers, had pointed to Jesus as He who should come after him. If, therefore, they had believed on the Baptist, that decided the reply to their question—through whom God had granted Jesus the legitimation of His Messianic destiny. On the other hand, it was impossible for them to dispute the Baptist's mission. The people, especially the populace of Judea, honoured him as a God-sent prophet; and the hierarchy justly feared that, by declaring the baptism of John to be a human work voluntarily undertaken, they might thereby endanger their authority. In truth, then, there was nothing else left for them to do but to declare themselves incompetent to answer Jesus' question. This confession of pretended ignorance, however, was really only an admission that in times past they had not done their duty towards him whom by their conduct they declared to be a false prophet, and that now they did not dare to express their true opinion

of him. Because they dared not openly recognise the only authority to which Jesus could appeal, He refused an answer to their question, which indeed He could not have given in any way that would have contented them.[1]

It is quite according to the manner of the older and more popular tradition, that it has only preserved out of these negotiations between Jesus and the hierarchy such isolated details as the refusal to answer the question as to authority. This certainly does not mean, however, that Jesus kept to this purely negative bearing, for in the further course of these transactions the question regarding their position to the Baptist was pursued still farther, and had far-reaching consequences, such as the Fourth Gospel recounts. Indeed, the fact of their once having sent to the Baptist a deputation, which heard his reference to the Messiah as He who was to come after him, and who had already appeared (John v. 33), is the tacit presupposition which led to that preliminary question being put. For in His own person Jesus could have done without the Baptist's legitimation; but a reference to it might have been very useful to them if they had only estimated his appearance better, and had accorded to it more than a superficial attention (John v. 34 f.). This is the particular reason why, in respect to their refusal to take up a distinct position regarding the Baptist, Jesus renounced his and any legitimation.

In figurative words, which quite correspond with His manner of speech as given in the older Gospels, Jesus described the Baptist as a light which had the power of showing the way to Him, — as a clear-burning lamp shining unconcealed. Precisely because John offers us no

[1] Jesus was not silent because He saw through the malevolence of their purpose, and did not wish to put any means of proof in their hands; neither was it because in relation to them He laid claim to a right which the Baptist had proved himself incapable of exercising. This was therefore no mere rhetorical fencing on Jesus' part, it was the simple consequence of the position into which they had brought themselves by their previous conduct. Still less, however, must we assume, with the modern sensational description of the life of Jesus, that this reference to John and his baptism startled the hierarchy, because this popular agitator had been their terror, his life a sacrifice on their part, and his baptism the scouted sign of the conspirator; our Gospels are perfectly ignorant of the hierarchy having any concern in the murder of the Baptist.

further elucidation, it is undoubtedly a historical reminiscence that Jesus described their bearing to the Baptist as that of children who found pleasure for a time in the light which proceeded from him, but would not employ it for the purpose it was meant to serve (John v. 35). We learn from this that even the Council had looked for a time with satisfaction upon the action of the Baptist, and had found that their interests were favourably affected by the agitation he produced, although they discovered only too soon that his purpose was not theirs. The fourth evangelist opens his narrative significantly and impressively with the witness of the Baptist, but it is certainly not his combination when Jesus here declines it as being merely human (v. 34). We can understand it perfectly, for this testimony rested upon the human experience gained by the Baptist at Jesus' baptism, and his message from prison has shown how little this had produced immutable certainty in himself even, so that Jesus would not possibly have rested upon it. He had no need of a legitimation from the Baptist, for He was Himself directly conscious of His divine authority for entering upon the Messianic calling, and God had given Him other proofs of His authority than mere human testimony. On a former occasion He had given a miracle of healing as the token of His Messianic authority (Matt. ix. 6), but in the present case He referred to the works (John v. 36) through which He was legitimized by the Father Himself (v. 32). By this He did not mean miraculous actions merely, but His whole life-creating ministry, to which He had referred earlier in the negotiations, and which was to bring on the great crisis deciding the salvation of the nation. He certainly could not conceal from Himself that the hierarchy not only would not estimate this at its full importance, but that to them, as to the people, it seemed far too contradictory of what the Scriptures of the Old Testament seemed to show would be the specific Messianic work. This led of itself to the question as to the Messianic prophecy in which He had ultimately to find His highest legitimation, for He claimed to be the Messiah come to fulfil this prophecy.[1]

[1] The fourth evangelist has clothed what was said in these negotiations with the hierarchy in the form of a continuous address, and in v. 31 he has evidently

It was, in truth, in an age destitute of revelation that the hierarchy refused to recognise the prophetical office of the Baptist. None of them had ever heard the voice of God, or seen His face, as the old prophets had done. They only possessed the records of ancient revelations which were contained in Holy Writ, and the zeal in Israel for investigating into Scripture testified to the value set upon it. Notwithstanding this, however, they imagined they possessed the highest good in the outward possession of these writings, and that showed that they had not truly assimilated the revelation contained in them. All through the Scriptures a future salvation was pointed to, which Jehovah was to prepare for His people. But the apathetic position constantly taken up by the hierarchy towards the Messianic expectation showed that, in spite of their outward reverence for the Scriptures, the inner kernel of it was strange to them. On this very account Jesus could not expect that they would understand the Scriptures as He understood them, nor that they would find indicated there the execution of the Messianic vocation, which He found. For Jesus was conscious that all He declared of Himself, and all that He did in accomplishing the task of His vocation, was done in order to fulfil the Scriptures, and that they pointed to just such a Messiah as He was. The Scriptures themselves therefore formed His highest legitimation, and the position which the hierarchy took up towards Him would necessarily be a proof of their attitude to Holy Writ, and to the divine revelation contained therein (John v. 37–39).

But what attitude was it which they had taken up in

had the question in mind as to how Jesus could legitimize His claim to the Messianic vocation. Here, therefore, the human testimony of the Baptist is treated of, as well as the indirect testimony of Jesus' own works and the direct witness of God in the Scriptures. But even this connection with the idea of testimony, which is so usual with the evangelist, although hardly suitable to this place, shows that he has carried out didactically, according to a literary scheme of his own, the reminiscences of the principal points here treated of. Those historical recollections, however, which show through everywhere, and are not prepared for by the Gospel (comp. ver. 35), or quite accommodated to its presuppositions (comp. ver. 34), show clearly that this is not a free literary composition whose motives are exhausted by expounding Jesus' relation to the Baptist, or by proving the contradictions involved in their unbelief in his signs; far less, then, can it be a mere remodelling of synoptic material.

regard to Him? Till now they really had not troubled themselves about Him at all, although from the beginning He had given as His watchword what was highest and dearest to every Israelite. But the only consummation of the theocracy in which they had any interest was such as promised them an augmentation of wealth or power. This had been manifest before from the transitory character of their pleasure in the proclamation of the Baptist, and would be manifest later, when false Messiahs should appear, flattering their self-interest. They were really perfectly indifferent to a kingdom of God which was exclusively concerned with the realization of the divine will. And therefore they had no sympathetic feeling for His proclamation, which in the name of God began by requiring that fulfilment of His will as the first condition for the consummation of the theocracy. Their moderate religious requirements were completely satisfied by the possession of God's ancient revelation. It had never occurred to them that they could receive anything in this connection from the Galilean prophet, and that was the reason for their not troubling themselves about Him. Jesus referred this to a want of love to God, such as the Scriptures should have roused in them, if they had truly assimilated them inwardly, and which would have led of necessity to a community of interests, and therefore to acknowledgment of Him (v. 40–43).

The events at this feast, however, had shown that they were not only indifferent to Him, but that they even regarded their authority as threatened by the manner in which, in the consciousness of the unique character of His relation to God, He acted independently of all human authority. This Jesus referred to their ambition, and their striving for honour from men (John v. 44); and indeed these were the radical faults of a hierarchy whose whole position rested upon their popularity. It was on account of this popularity alone that foreign rulers had allowed them to retain what they still possessed of power and influence. A kingdom of God, in which they were to play no part, and in the establishing of which they were unnecessary, was nothing less than an attempt to subvert their position of authority. At this feast Jesus had asserted His authority to be independent of theirs,

and therefore they saw themselves summoned to battle along the whole line. But this worldly ambition was only another token that they were lacking in love to God, and that their egotistical interests far surpassed the higher interests in whose behoof Jesus appeared. At His first encounter with the hierarchy, Jesus told them plainly what the deepest motives were for their not taking up the true position in regard to Him; their selfishness and ambition rendered them incapable of recognising His divine mission. If they had lived in the Scriptures as He did, the inwardly assimilated revelation would have roused in them that love to God and zeal for His honour, which from inward sympathy would have caused them to recognise in Him the accomplisher of salvation promised by Scripture, without Him requiring to demonstrate it to them. Their attitude towards Him, therefore, was a testimony to their false position towards Scripture, which rendered them incapable of finding there the divine legitimation for His appearance.

The dispute had arisen because of His alleged revolt against the law of Moses. But Jesus cited His opponents before the judgment-seat of God, where this same Moses, upon whom they placed their hopes, would accuse them of not accepting his reference to Him of whom all Scripture as well as Moses prophesied. Jesus did not honour Moses less, but more than they did; and the Scripture on whose account they accused Him, accused them yet more. He certainly could not hope to find faith in them if they did not even believe their esteemed Moses and their highly revered Scriptures (v. 45-47). This was His final answer to the question, Who had given Him the authority with which He appeared? In the name of God He had put His judges face to face with their Judge, and had placed His accusers upon their trial. This was the commencement of the rupture with the hierarchy which was irremediable and momentous. It was to be a life and death struggle with this Galilean Messiah.

The hour of this conflict, however, had not yet arrived. Very different conditions would show with what prospects they could enter upon it.

# CHAPTER XL

## THE DISCIPLES' RETURN.

IT was probably the town of Capernaum, the usual centre of His ministry, and perhaps the house of Peter, which Jesus fixed upon as the place where He and His disciples were to meet again. The month of March was drawing to a close, in the second half of which the temple tax had been collected. After the exile it was incumbent upon every Israelite, whether rich or poor, who had attained the age of twenty, to pay into the temple treasury half a shekel, which in value was equal to a Greek drachma (Ex. xxx. 13 f.). The days had passed when payment ought to be made, before Jesus and His disciples met in the city. They were found out by the collectors, who questioned Peter as to whether Jesus had not paid the temple tribute; perhaps Peter was addressed because Jesus was then residing in his house, or because he was already regarded as the most prominent of Jesus' company of intimate disciples. The same claim of course applied to the whole company, but people were accustomed to regard them as dependent upon Jesus. Whether the question was merely a respectful intimation, or a reproachful reminder of the neglected payment, whether it supposed that Jesus might possibly claim exemption from the tax, or possibly covered an inclination to recognise the claim,—all this it is impossible to decide, for it entirely depended upon the tone in which the question was put. If such a possibility was thought of, that would only show how generally known Jesus' Messianic claims were, and how people expected Him to assert His claims in public life; for His possession of the Messianic dignity could be the only reason for His believing Himself exempt from the temple tribute.

Peter's answering the question at once in the affirmative is explained by the fact that Jesus had hitherto always sub-

mitted to the standing regulations, and fulfilled all legal obligations (Matt. xvii. 24 f.).[1] Jesus, however, by no means regarded this as a matter of course, and asked Peter whether it was usual in worldly circumstances for dues to be exacted from members of the royal house or from subjects; when Peter replied that the law was only binding upon subjects, He deduced the conclusion that the sons were therefore free (xvii. 25 f.). And so also the Son of God, like every other prince, must be free from an impost which, like this for the maintenance of the temple, was paid to Jehovah Himself as King of the theocracy; and as Messiah, Jesus was Son of God in the highest sense. But this decision only opened out a wider perspective. In the perfected kingdom of God all subjects shall be sons of God in the most complete sense, and the way in which the Messiah would ever remain the unique One among them all did not fall to be considered here. The kingdom of God was destined, besides, to extend over the whole nation, and to embrace all its members (Luke xiii. 19), who would therefore be exempt from the temple tribute; and since the temple could not be kept up without it, this declaration opened up a vista towards a time when the necessity for a temple would be done away with by the consummation of the theocracy, because worship would not then be circumscribed to one spot (John iv. 21; comp. p. 172).[2]

Things had not yet, however, gone so far as this, and Jesus did not assert, either for Himself or His disciples, such im-

[1] This account, which he probably got from oral tradition, the first evangelist, without paying any attention to the unknown time of its occurrence, has introduced into Mark's narrative at the point when Jesus, on His return from a considerable journey, entered into a house in Capernaum (Mark ix. 33). It is a most gratuitous assumption to think that the evangelist intended to show that Jesus had a supernatural knowledge of the occurrence. It is clear that Mark's account was in his mind, and according to that Jesus had Himself called attention to another question about which the disciples had disputed by the way. He represents Jesus as taking the initiative, without explaining further how He came to know of the incident; indeed, all his attention was taken up by the important words uttered on this occasion.

[2] Although only preserved in one of the younger Gospels, it is clear that this narrative is founded upon credible tradition from the unsuccessful attempts made by criticism to prove it to be a fiction of tendency. It may be said that this gives Jesus' decision regarding the obligation resting upon the Jewish Christians to pay the temple tribute, but of course that could have no further bearing after the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. It is just as meaningless

munity from the tax. He would have given just offence by so doing, for that might have given rise to the false impression that His establishment of the kingdom of God in Israel was intended in some way to bring about the overthrow of the legal regulations. For this reason He bade Peter procure a stater, or coin of the value of four drachmas, and give it for himself and Jesus (Matt. xvii. 27). This manifestly means that the other disciples were to follow their example. Many people have found great difficulties from the way in which Jesus bade Peter procure the money. According to the simple purport of the statement, Jesus sent him out a-fishing, promising him that he would find a stater, not in the mouth, but in the inside of the first fish that took the bait.[1] But when sending him upon this errand, Jesus said distinctly that the money was not to be miraculously created, but that Peter was to procure it while in pursuit of his ordinary profession. If we suppose that Jesus added here a statement of how easy it was for God so to bless this means that they should not lack what they needed to perform their voluntarily undertaken duty, this makes it quite comprehensible why such profound words should have early been apprehended by the oral tradition, from which the narrative was derived, to mean that God would bless this fishing by an especial miracle. It is worthy of note, that although these words are so apprehended in our narrative, not a syllable is said of the result which followed, although the actual point of

to make this refer, as Wieseler does, to the Roman poll tax, which, moreover, could not be collected in Herod's dominions, or to say that the Roman tribute was meant, which after the fall of the temple took the place of the tax. The whole discussion shows that a tax was in question which was paid to Jehovah Himself as King of the theocracy.

[1] The reproach that this miracle was without an object is made because Jesus, even if the coffers were empty, was then in the town where so many of His followers dwelt, from whom He could undoubtedly have procured the necessary sum without thereby invalidating the divine prohibition of taking on credit. He did not intend to show Himself as the ruler of the world who fulfilled human law through the power of His divinity. His superhuman knowledge of a miraculous dispensation is pointed out in a profound way—for it is to that the statement refers, and not to any magical production of a Roman coin, or to its creation by an act of divine power. In order to ratify His independence, God will give Him in a miraculous way what Jesus desires to pay to Him out of regard for men. All the attempts have been in vain which were made by the older Rationalism to put a non-miraculous meaning into these words.

the whole narrative lay in that, if Jesus really promised a miracle.

When they returned from their journey, it was, of course, the first duty of the disciples to report to their Master what they had effected by their cures and instruction (Mark vi. 30). They were particularly delighted to be able to tell that in His name they had cast out devils (Luke x. 17).[1] And Jesus recognised the great importance of these consequences of their labour. It seemed to Him as if a decisive blow had been struck at Satanic authority, when not only He but also His disciples could rescue those who were in bondage to that power. The annihilating defeat of this Satan who ruled humanity, which He saw in these expulsions of demons, Jesus described as Satan's fall from the heights of heaven (comp. Isa. xiv. 12; Matt. xi. 23), from its likeness to the descent of lightning. The fall of the Satanic power, however, prepares the way for the kingdom of God on earth. But the disciples were not to imagine that they owed these results to their own power and ability. It was Jesus who gave them power to crush the Satanic forces under their feet, and to come uninjured out of the conflict as conquerors. He also warned them particularly not to rejoice over these brilliant successes, which might be dangerous for them if they led to vanity and ambition. Their only joy should be, that as His disciples they were subjects of the kingdom of God, and had their names written in heaven, *i.e.* were assured of participation in that kingdom (Luke x. 18–20).

[1] It certainly does not follow from this that Jesus had not distinctly given them authority to do so, for from all the three Gospels we learn that this was what He actually did. With the authorization to command the evil spirits in His name, it was not at all necessary that they should succeed in expelling them, for incidentally it is assumed quite correctly that under certain circumstances that result might not be attained (comp. Mark ix. 18). Luke represents these words as being spoken to the returning seventy; but as we have seen that the commission speech, which in his source is directed to the seventy, was really addressed to the Twelve (comp. p. 307, note), that would doubtless be the case with the following dialogue as well (x. 17–20). The continuation of the address to them (Luke x. 21–24) the first evangelist has introduced into an independent retrospect of His ministry (Matt. xi. 25–30), though still in indirect connection with the commission speech (chap. x.). Luke only omits the words in Matt. xi. 28–30, and the introduction to the speech, which he puts at the close in order to separate it from the prayer (x. 23 f.), is placed by the first evangelist in quite another connection (Matt. xiii. 16 f.).

It was probably in this connection that Jesus esteemed His disciples happy because of what they had seen and heard. In His own appearance they had beheld nothing else than the dawning of the age of salvation, and in His proclamation they had heard that this ensured the commencement of the consummation of salvation. Many prophets and holy men of the Old Covenant had desired to see what they had seen, and to hear what they had heard; with ardent longings they had looked for the promised consummation, and yet had not been permitted to see and hear anything. But to them it was given to behold the salvation which had appeared in Jesus (Luke x. 23 f.). This was their great and incomparable superiority over the mightiest figures of the Old Covenant, and this was why Jesus had once declared that the least of those in the kingdom was superior to the mighty prophet who had prepared the way for it (Matt. xi. 11).[1] Innumerable multitudes had undoubtedly seen and heard just what they had done, but without attaining to a true understanding of what was involved thereby. The fact of its having been disclosed to them was an act of divine grace which opened their eyes and ears, while in the case of others they remained closed. But God did not select them arbitrarily from among the thousands of their nation; it was an inviolable divine ordinance, according to which the momentous decision was effectuated; to some the salvation which had appeared was to be revealed in what they heard and saw, while to others it would remain concealed. This was the case with the most of those who heard the parables concerning the kingdom of God; they did not inquire as to the meaning, and, in accordance with the counsel of God, salvation was concealed from them as a punishment for their non-receptivity (Mark iv. 11 f.). It was upon this occasion that Jesus thanked His Father, the all-powerful Ruler of the world and the Lord over heaven and earth, that it had been His good pleasure to hide these things from the wise and understanding, and to reveal

[1] The comparison with the great names of the Old Testament shows that Jesus did not praise them on account of their right seeing and hearing, nor because of their receptivity, as the first evangelist understood (Matt. xiii. 16 f.), but because of what in association with Him they were permitted to see and to hear.

them to the simple (Matt. xi. 25 f.). For if any degree of human wisdom and sagacity were requisite for attaining this knowledge-bringing salvation, a great portion of the people would have been equally excluded from it. As it was, however, it was made accessible to all; for the wise and sagacious had to give up all their wisdom and sagacity, which could not assist them in the attainment, in order to receive in entire simplicity the tidings of salvation. In the experience of His own operations and the successes met with by His disciples, Jesus traced distinctly this divine rule. The cultured of the nations, the scribes and the great authorities of the people, had steeled themselves against His proclamation in the darkness of their wisdom and sagacity, which had no desire for improved knowledge; but He had found acceptance with these simple unlettered men of the people. Of course this statement did not refer to the Twelve alone, but along with them to all who hitherto had been followers of Jesus, and among whom there were almost certainly such as willingly laid their intelligence and learning down before Him, in order to receive from Him in all simplicity what was more important still.

It was a moment of deep feeling when Jesus looked back upon the results of His ministry; and Luke is not mistaken in saying that His soul rejoiced as He thanked the Father for the sacred regulations He had attached to it (Luke x. 21). For it was Jesus who was called upon to carry out that divine decree, and to whom everything was given over by His Father regarding the announcement of the truth, as well as its momentous concealment from those who would not receive it in the right way.[1] They are both given over to Him by the Father, because the Father has a knowledge of the Son such as no other possesses, and is therefore aware that He, as no one else, has all His thoughts and inclinations,

[1] It is incomprehensible how any one could suppose that this meant the surrender of the government of the world, which Jesus had just distinctly attributed to the Father, before whom He bowed in humble gratitude. We must not even think that this refers to the whole execution of redemption, nor even of what belonged to the establishment and conduct of the kingdom of God. According to the connection in which it stands, all that is meant is the revelation mediated by Jesus which contained the true secret of His Messianic ministry.

His desires and endeavours, directed by the divine will, and so carries in Himself a perfect image of the Father; for it is that only which renders Him capable of executing the decree according to His Father's will. According to this decree, however, the Father Himself is to be revealed by Him who comes to His people in the age of salvation, saving, reviving, and blessing them, and who by bringing them the promised salvation makes Him known down to the profoundest depths of His being, namely, in His unsearchable love and grace. This revelation of God in sending His Messiah can, however, only be interpreted by Him who, as no one else has done, has seen from childhood into His Father's heart, and has experienced in His own soul what He is to make known to the whole nation, and what He daily perceives in the consciousness of His own proper calling, and represents through His fulfilment of it. The character of His Father, which is revealed to Him alone, He can reveal to whom He will; for if He thanks God for the regulation according to which this is to happen, He will only make it known to them to whom the Father wishes it revealed; and the Searcher of hearts, who alone knows Him perfectly, is aware that the will of the Son is one with His own. For that reason the Father can give everything into His hands (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22). Jesus' whole ministry, both of word and act, led to the accomplishment of that divine operation of grace which opens eyes and ears for the recognition of the completed divine revelation in Him and His appearance.

The Johannine tone of these words has ever been justly renowned. Here if anywhere has the Fourth Gospel given the preference to such words of Jesus as emphasize the greatest benefits which in virtue of His Messianic calling He came to bring, namely, the highest revelation of all, that of God's paternal love, which had been manifested in sending Him. And here if anywhere is Jesus' authorization for this distinctly referred to the unique character of His knowledge of God, as well as to His own unique nature. But it is to introduce Johannine ideas into the words of Jesus to make Him express, partly by mysterious intimations and partly with didactic distinctness, what are really the most special

characteristics of the Fourth Gospel; these are the origination of Jesus' knowledge of God in His original existence with Him, and the reference to His eternal God-equal nature.[1] But it is certainly permitted, nay, even commanded, to stop here upon the height of Jesus' Messianic existence, as before at the first glimpses of His Messianic consciousness (comp. vol. i. p. 305), and ask whether the knowledge of His unique relation to God, on which the consciousness of His calling was founded, may not have stretched beyond and over itself. He did not become possessed of His special knowledge through any divine revelation, He had met with it in Himself from the very beginning; He did not determine at any moment in His human existence to reveal the same to His people, it was the very purpose of His life upon earth, in which was fulfilled the eternal decree of the Father regarding His people's salvation. But His knowledge of God, which could not have originated upon earth, must have done so in heaven; His relation of Sonship did not take its rise in time, but only in eternity. The duty of proclaiming this love as the ground of an eternally divine decree which He had to execute upon the people, could only have been proved by the love of a Father, which He had possessed from all eternity. In this sense it may be said that even such statements as these point to the profoundest secret of Jesus' self-consciousness; but it is neither historically conceivable that He

[1] An attempt has been made to prove that this was supposed to consist in the unique relation between the Father and the Son, just as is here assumed; and the peculiar character of that relation certainly receives particular expression in this saying, which speaks of the Father and the Son as if this connection existed once for all. It has been overlooked in this surmise, however, that precisely in this statement the relation appears as a peculiar love and confidence existing between them, according to which each knows the other as no one else does, and the Father delivers to the Son the execution of His decree, because the Son has completely yielded to His will, that is, has resigned Himself entirely. The unique knowledge of the Son by the Father has therefore been pointed out as giving ground for the supposition that this presupposed in Jesus a mysteriously supernatural character. This certainly cannot merely arise from the recognition of His divine mission or the dignity of His calling, which was manifest to every one of His believing adherents, nor from the miracle of His birth, which could not be hidden from the nearest of His kinsmen. Scripture only speaks of One whom the Searcher of hearts alone knows; and all that according to the connection can be meant here is the understanding of His deepest religio-ethical character and life, which rendered Him fit for the purpose of His commission.

intended to make it known, nor is it in any way indicated by the letter of the statement.

It is by no means necessary to suppose that a more extended group of auditors were gathered around Jesus when He turned with that affecting summons to all who were exerting themselves in vain and passing through life weighed down with heavy burdens, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi. 28). He may perhaps have meant to point out to the disciples what it was He had most of all come to communicate, for even yet that was not quite clear to them. But it is not impossible that others besides them were present, and in any case the disciples were one day to carry these words to the people, as indeed was to be done with all that He had spoken to them in private (Matt. x. 27). In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus had spoken of a hungering and thirsting after righteousness (v. 6); here He speaks of honest exertion for the attainment of the same, which, however sincerely it is meant, only succeeds in making the weight of the still unfulfilled obligation a yet more grievous burden. The repose promised by Jesus is therefore only possible when He points out the way by which this burden may be removed and the end be attained of the hitherto useless exertions. It is the way to accomplish this that Jesus here indicates. The yoke they are to take upon them is the symbol of the guidance and discipline to which they are to yield themselves, and by which they shall learn of Him how rightly to find refreshment for their souls (comp. Jer. vi. 16).[1] Jesus not

[1] The heavy burden of which Jesus spoke was certainly not the weight of the Pharisaic precepts, for the way in which He required the fulfilment of the law, because it was more profound and comprehensive, did not lighten the burden of obligation, but increased it; and just as little did His easy yoke form a contrast to the imperious conduct of those who had hitherto been the guides of the people. This does not say why they were to come to Him and to no other, but it does tell why they will be able to learn under His direction what under the guidance of the law was impossible. Attempts have been made to find out all manner of Old Testament parallels to these words, but it has not been taken into account that they contain what the Old Testament with its merely legal requirements neither could nor would offer. It is indeed God's perfected revelation which they present — that new motive which by divine power is creative of that new life whose realization was the end of all God's promises of grace and paths of salvation.

only revealed the divine will, but He fulfilled it. In His meekness in enduring wrong, and in His humility in letting Himself down to the least if He could thereby serve them, the ideal is realized of a child of God, who resembles his Father. The light and easy yoke is to learn of Him who imposes no other duty than what He shows the fulfilment of, and who makes the imitation of His blessed life of love a profound necessity (Matt. xi. 29 f.). For this is no mere prototype; He it is who realizes the character of divine Sonship in an ideal way—the Son of God, the Chosen One in whom divine love approaches His people to make of them all true children of God. It is not possible to see Him without loving Him, nor to love without becoming like Him; and that is the way which leads to refreshment for the soul, for in Him the righteousness is realized which is beholden to no law except itself. The revelation which Jesus brought was certainly concealed from the wise among the people, for in the obscurity of their own knowledge the receptivity was lacking which craved for true knowledge; and therefore the refreshment which He procured for the soul, by pointing it the way to righteousness, He could only offer to those who sought anxiously and earnestly for the right way of attaining this end. To the righteous according to the law He had as little to offer as He had to reveal to those who were proud of their own wisdom. His words, however, proclaimed the love of God, which approaches all sinners with its saving grace, and His whole existence revealed this love in a way that was creative both of light and love; in imitating Him, therefore, the likeness of the Father must necessarily be realized in the children (Matt. v. 45).

Much has lately been said about the majesty of the moment distinguished by these utterances of Jesus. New conceptions have been talked of which then dawned upon Him, as well as of a new perception of God which transcended that of the Jews; or at least an increased Messianic consciousness has been alluded to, and a profound knowledge of Sonship which was now felt for the first time. The passages have been counted where Jesus speaks of God as *His* Father, while previously He had only spoken to His followers of *their* Father, and from this attempts have been made to show

progress in His own development, and in the knowledge of His highest calling. It has not been taken into account, however, that the twelve-year-old boy in the temple spoke of His Father in the same exclusive sense as here (Luke ii. 49); Jesus probably often called God the Father of the subjects of the kingdom, but never included Himself with them in calling Him our Father, and therefore the unique character of His consciousness of Sonship was the fundamental basis of His whole life and action. It may be remembered that when at the feast in Jerusalem Jesus was compelled by His controversy with the hierarchy to express more clearly and directly than usual this peculiarity of His consciousness of Sonship, and that He now declared with equal clearness and distinctness before His disciples what had filled His soul since that time. But it must not be forgotten that even the disciples, by their first trial of independent work, which He had just heard of from their reports, had proved themselves to be more mature and receptive for such explanations than had been the case at an earlier period.

To regard this passage as containing the true interpretation of Jesus' Messianic idea, is to abstract entirely from the historical meaning of the name, which is not possible without self-deception; this has generally been done in order to show that Jesus led humanity to knowledge of God and of life in Him, that He made known the Fatherhood of God and the natural law, which is yielded by the heart and by morality. What it was He promised to the whole people when He led His disciples to the certainty that He, and He alone, was the chosen Son of God, these disciples could only explain from the prophets of the Old Testament. The revelation of which Jesus spoke was to them the actual revelation of God's character, involved in the sending of the Messiah, who was to bring the people the consummation of salvation; the refreshment of soul He promised them, was the realization by the Messiah of their religio-ethical ideal in the perfected theocracy. But by these declarations Jesus did not intend to dispute the fact, that in and with that revelation and this realization a salvation was destined and prepared for the people as such that far transcended the religious satisfaction of the individual, and even remodelled the outward life of the nation. These

explanations were only intended to assist the disciples in clearly comprehending the profoundest reason and the indispensable presupposition of the same, and in making use of them. The result of such words, of course, was to elevate their Master's form higher and higher; but it was really His unique position of honour which alone conditioned and bounded this majesty. History teaches that the disciples were first introduced into the deepest secret of Jesus' nature, as it lay like a presentiment in His self-consciousness, by the fact of His heavenly exaltation, and the bestowal of the Spirit which pointed it out to them. But the claim of this unique majesty, the knowledge of which He had roused in them, either had reason and right in that secret of His self-consciousness, or it was an evidence of unsupportable pride, outrageous insolence, and over-appreciation of self.[1]

It must have been at this time, when Jesus was enjoying the society of His disciples, that one of them asked Him to teach them to pray, as John also had taught his followers (Luke xi. 1). This reference to the Baptist's disciples shows that the request was addressed to Jesus by one of His constant companions. Luke seems to think that it was suggested to them by their often having seen Him pray. It could not be that, however, but rather the experience they had gained on their missionary journey. In their domestic connection with Jesus, He had of course associated them in His life of prayer; as the "house father," He had doubtlessly prayed with and for them. But the first time they had been independent of Him, they had discovered that even praying has to be learned. It is probable that Jesus replied to them in the words which the first evangelist used as an introduction when he inserted the Lord's Prayer in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 7), although they were utterly unsuitable for that connection; the same words presumably occupied the identical

[1] Renan has gone so far as to assume the last. The enthusiasm of Jesus' scholars is said to have hurried Him along. The position to which He laid claim was a supernatural one, for He wished people to regard Him as having a closer connection with God than all other men. Renan regards this as perfectly natural and innocent. Jesus is not to be judged according to the puny regulations of our proprieties; candour towards oneself has no meaning to Orientals, who are little accustomed to the niceness of the critical spirit. The only culpable thing in such a case is the humanity which is deceived.

position in the oldest source from which Luke took the prayer. In praying, said Jesus, do not use vain repetitions. It is a heathen notion to suppose that one will be heard for much speaking. It is indeed true that among the Gentiles the repetition of the same prayer a hundered times over, and an untiring invocation of deity under different epithets, were not at all unusual; the petitioners thought to weary out the gods by so doing, and at the same time to constrain their attention. Such praying soon becomes a senseless babbling. In contrast to this, Jesus gave His disciples as a pattern a short prayer, full of meaning, which contained everything they required to ask for (Matt. vi. 9). From this model they were to learn the art of praying correctly. But after Jesus had once expressed in this prayer all that the disciples had to ask, it was only natural that when those who believed on Him felt their unfitness to pray aright, they should continually go back upon His words, and express through them what they desired to bring before God.[1]

The one entirely new thing in this prayer was that Jesus instructed His disciples to call upon the God of heaven and earth as their Father. It is possible, of course, to apprehend this conversely, indeed it has been supposed that Jesus silently put the word "Father" in place of the ancient sacred name of Jehovah, or else that He expressed thereby His new knowledge of God, which He desired to communicate to the world, namely, that God was the loving Father of all men. But it was not possible for Jesus to laud more gloriously or to teach the reception of God's love more affectingly than that was done in the Old Testament. Neither there nor in this

[1] It is empty hypercriticism which supposes that this so-called Lord's Prayer probably took its rise in the Church, and on account of the importance to which it attained was referred to Jesus Himself. Another assumption is that the disciples learnt it from Jesus by hearing Him offer it repeatedly. But apart from the fact that Jesus could have no need to ask for forgiveness of sins, He certainly was not reduced to the constant repetition of the same formula. Neither did He intend it to be such for His disciples. Luke was right in inculcating it upon his young Gentile Christians, and indeed, although much in his version of the petitions is plainly secondary, yet it was in order to make it more serviceable for them that he put it in as short a form as possible (xi. 2–4). It is perfectly inconceivable, however, that after the first evangelist had given Jesus' warning about vain repetitions (Matt. vi. 9–13), he should amplify and enlarge upon Jesus' traditionary prayer with glosses of his own.

case was it intended to say that God was the Father of all men, although this is often assumed without further inquiry, on the ground of a modern misconception which disregards all the historical presuppositions of His words. This similitude, which is taken from the highest of human relationships of affection, is in both cases only transferred to a special connection, which in the course of the history of salvation God had instituted between Himself and His chosen ones. But when in the kingdom of heaven the theocracy is consummated and all promises are fulfilled, not only will the chosen nation be assured of God's paternal love, but each individual subject of the kingdom will then in the fullest sense be a son of God, and may call upon God as his Father.[1] This kingdom of God came with Jesus, and whoever saw in Him the expected Messiah belonged to it. It was no longer bodily descent from the fathers which was the condition of participation in this realm, it was the voluntary following of Jesus. Each individual therefore might share in the blessings of the kingdom, and more than that, in God's love towards the subjects, which was first perfectly realized in Jesus. It is certainly not conduct that will make him a son of God, he can indeed only be so in the sense of ethical resemblance of character; through tidings of the kingdom God has approached him with His grace, and He makes any one who accepts that at once His child, and a subject of the kingdom. Precisely because it is only in the kingdom of God and in company with the subjects of the same that one is assured of God's paternal love, did Jesus teach His disciples not to cry to God simply as "Father," as He did (Matt. xi. 25), and as Luke abbreviates it, but as the common Father of the subjects of that realm. Jesus Himself had once appealed to the God of

[1] In virtue of his selection, Israel was the son who could boast of the paternal love of his God, and in this sense God's name of Father was strange to no pious Israelite (comp. vol. i. p. 279). But God was the Father of His people, the individual only shared in His paternal love in so far as he belonged to this people; and in the salvation, promised to the nation as such, it was by no means necessary that each individual should participate equally, if at all. Indeed, it was impossible that this could be so; some of the people were unworthy, and it was foreseen in all the promises that before their fulfilment took place these unworthy members would have to be extirpated by a divine judgment.

heaven and of earth, and therefore He taught His disciples to look up to Him who is throned in heaven; and that they might be reminded of what the Ruler of all can and desires to bestow, He bade them say, "Our Father which art in heaven."

The coming of the kingdom of God is what most greatly interests its subjects; indeed, Jesus had shown in the parables of the treasure and the pearl that this must be the highest good of His disciples. The kingdom of God was undoubtedly there where those clustered around Jesus, who saw in Him the expected Messiah (Matt. xi. 11; Luke xvii. 21); and just as certain was it, that it would yet have to be realized among the people generally. It was already realized in Him, and would be more and more so in the course of His development; but God alone opens by His gracious operation the eyes and ears of those to whom His coming is manifest (Matt. xi. 25); He alone could bring it to pass, that through Jesus' proclamation increased numbers should be won for the kingdom of God, causing it thereby to make progress among the people. On that account God must ever be called on afresh, and that is why the first three petitions revolved round the coming of the kingdom of God. It might appear, indeed, as if this new relationship of love and confidence between the subjects and God would injure the recognition of His holiness in the Old Testament sense. But it is this very passage which shows how far the ancient name of Jehovah was from being supplanted. Even before this prayer for the kingdom, Jesus sent up a petition for the hallowing of God's name.[1] Everything revealed by the Old Testament regarding this supernatural holiness of God, and all that it employs in His name to secure the most complete reverence being paid

[1] Even in the specially esteemed synagogue prayer, Kaddish, the petition for the sovereignty of the kingdom of God preceded that for the hallowing of the divine name. It is not absolutely demonstrable, but neither is it improbable, that this prayer was used in the synagogues at the time of Jesus; if so, He must have linked His prayer intentionally with the national petition. At an earlier period people had a special liking for finding out all manner of coincidences with Jewish prayers, but they never succeeded in showing that Christian tradition had exercised any influence. There is really nothing strange in the fact of Jesus purposely attaching His prayer to the old familiar words. What He taught His disciples to pray for was really what every pious Israelite longed and besought for. This is all that can be absolutely proved.

to Him, is to be recognised by the keeping holy of His name. The holy awe with which the being of the Holy One was recognised in Israel, which made people fear to offend Him, was to be the fundamental presupposition for the coming of the kingdom of God. That kingdom can only come among those who fear God, and these, even in the Old Testament, were looked upon as being the true Israelites; the kingdom will come when those believe in Him through whom it is to come. The first petition points to the preliminary condition of this coming, and the third to its final purpose. Among God's angels in heaven His will is perfectly fulfilled (comp. Ps. ciii. 21). When that also happens upon earth, the ultimate purpose will be attained for which the second petition implores,—the kingdom of God will have come. Luke has omitted this petition, because if the second one is fully granted it involves the fulfilment of the third; and that was sufficient for His Gentile Christians. It was not without special purpose, however, that Jesus added this request. The perfect realization of the kingdom of God will undoubtedly bring with it the fulness of all promised blessings, but the desires of the disciples were still preponderatingly directed to the external welfare of the nation. The breathing of this petition was therefore intended to show them afresh that the perfect fulfilment of the divine will in the consummation of the theocracy must always be the principal matter, and that with it everything else must be reconciled. It is only in connection with the prayer for the kingdom that the true importance of this request can be estimated, and that it can be offered in the sense Jesus meant it to be.

From praying for the greatest general good, the Lord's Prayer comes down to the necessities of individual existence; the disciple was never to ask these for himself alone, but for all who, along with him, had become sons of the heavenly Father. The petition is manifestly for what is the presupposition of all other possessions — for the supply of temporal necessities. Jesus had no sympathy whatever for the false spiritualism which would make this a request for spiritual things. To live as becomes a subject of the kingdom, man must necessarily exist, and for that end daily bread is needed. But Jesus only speaks of the simplest and most

indispensable means of nourishment, and distinctly limits His petition to what is absolutely requisite, leaving it to God to provide, if He will, for particular circumstances; the prayer only covers the day, for man is not to be anxious for the morrow (Matt. vi. 34). It was Luke who first thoughtfully generalized this petition for daily provision. The true disciple does not require to employ it so; for he offers prayer every day in order that, in this terrestrial sphere, he may ever be conscious of his dependence upon God, and may receive His gifts with gratitude. But even the life which is prolonged by daily bread loses all its value for the disciple when he is bowed down with the consciousness of guilt. Jesus assumed, even of the subjects of the kingdom, that they are still conscious of many faults, and have to pray for the forgiveness of sins just as constantly as they have for daily food. And He therefore opened up the prospect to His disciples that they were just as sure of the love of their heavenly Father, which forgave, as that which gave, assuming always that they had approved themselves His children. That was why He taught them to add, "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors." Their request was not to rest upon this, as Luke seems to have thought, nor was it a solemn promise of perpetual forgiveness, as might be gathered from his version of the words; forgiveness is an act of God's free grace, and the disciple who prayed daily for forgiveness knew only too well how feeble was the execution of his best intentions. It was didactic teaching of the profoundest description, when Jesus instructed each of His disciples to say that he *had* forgiven his debtors, as beseemed a son who copied the image of his heavenly Father. If he did not do so, he had not become like God in His power of forgiving love (Matt. v. 45), and being no true child of God, had no right to take upon his lips the prayer of the subjects of the kingdom. For it is in forgiving love that that affection is manifested, which is the characteristic of a child of God, even if not in its richest and purest form; it reaches this when forgiveness is conjoined with the affection which each one has means and opportunity for exercising, and for which the truly penitent confession of one's own sins, which is the condition of their forgiveness, makes one perfectly willing.

But the sin which occurs in and around him not only burdens the disciple with fresh guilt, but it constantly threatens him with new temptation. God Himself, who guides our paths, leads us into the situations which present us with occasions for sin, and proves whether we will give way to the temptation or vanquish the desire for what is prohibited, resisting it in obedience to the divine will. Through temptation, therefore, it is possible for the disciple to stand the test and receive the blessing; but conscious of his weakness, he will still daily pray: "Bring us not into temptation." It is with this petition that Luke closes the prayer; for if this petition is heard, the disciple has no longer anything to fear from sin. But Jesus knew that God cannot always grant such a request. Sometimes His wisdom will permit a temptation, in order that the disciple may be wholesomely humiliated or put to a salutary trial. That was why Jesus taught him to add another petition, that in case he were led into temptation, God would deliver him from the power of the evil one by granting him victory in his struggle with sin. The close of the second half of the prayer thus unites with what was said in the first; for in the degree in which sin is vanquished in the life of the individual subject of the kingdom, the divine will is realized in him as it is performed in heaven.[1]

In order to teach His disciples how to pray correctly, it was not only necessary that Jesus should show them *what* they were to ask for, but also *how* they were to present their petitions. It is only believing prayer which can be answered, and the confidence of faith will first approve itself thoroughly when the answer seems to be delayed. Faith, however, knows that the reply will come all the more surely as the disciple continues to pray with persistency and confidence in spite of

[1] The Lord's Prayer was thus divided originally into two sets of petitions; the first referring to God's name, kingdom, and will, and the second to our exigencies, guilt, and temptations. But it is also possible to place the request for daily bread in the centre, and to contrast the first three petitions for the attainment of the highest good—the kingdom of God, with the three last for the averting of the greatest evil—sin, and in this way to make the petitions seven in number. The doxology with which the Church has closed the Lord's Prayer rests the certainty of its being answered upon God's majesty, power, and glory, but undoubtedly did not belong to the oldest text.

its seeming as if he were not heard. It was this which Jesus proceeded to illustrate by the parable of a man who, late one evening, was visited by unexpected friends, and to provide for their wants went to borrow three loaves from a neighbour. The latter refused the request, because he was already in bed with his children; but finally, in order to get quit of the importunate petitioner, he gave him what he desired (Luke xi. 5–8). Even this parable has given offence to many, but that is only by proceeding upon the mistaken allegorizing view that God is here compared to the disobliging friend, and the persistent asker to the unabashed petitioner. According to the overwhelming evidence of the parable itself, it is taken from a relation of life which presents the strongest contrast with that to which the truth deduced from it is to be applied. Even in human relationships where bald egoism often leads to the refusal of friendly offices, persistency attains its ends, because the same egoism desires to be rid of the troublesome petitioner; indeed, the end is attained the more surely the more unabashed is the importunity. How much more certainly will the unwearied asker receive an answer from God, if only his faith does not fail![1]

It was thus possible for Jesus to connect with this parabolic picture the promise, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." In order to enhance the promise, the statement is twice repeated in a figurative form, and the second figure once more represents the petitioner as standing and knocking before his friend's door. Each one is thereafter assured that he may have this experience if he will (Luke xi. 9 f.). It is involved in the character of such gnomic utterances, that they put a statement categorically without the limitations which were necessary under the circumstances; indeed, it is in this that its force consists. The parable with which these remarks closed shows that prayer must be believing, and its confidence not interrupted by delay in the answer. Besides, it was to His disciples that Jesus spoke, and as subjects of the kingdom

[1] Such an exhortation to persevering prayer is in no wise contradictory of the warning against the Gentile much speaking, for the one is just as much an evidence of faith as the other is a proof of the unbelief and superstition which, like the unabashed friend, thinks to gain a hearing by importunity.

these could always count upon the willingness of their Father to hear them. It must be taken into account, however, that even in those remarks, while the petitioner is assured that he will be heard, and the seeker that he will find, it is nowhere directly said that what was asked will be granted. Jesus showed distinctly in the parable-pair with which He closed His exhortation that this could not always be the case (Luke xi. 11–13).[1] In these He seized with marvellous power upon a relation of life from which His description of the new connection to God, entered into by the subjects of the kingdom, borrowed its figure. This is the classic passage in which Jesus Himself explains sonship to God by the peculiar relation in which a human father stands to his child. No prudent father will on every occasion give his son what he desires. But it is inconceivable that instead of the requested bread he should give him a stone, and instead of fish a serpent, *i.e.* something useless and hurtful instead of what is useful and salutary. This refusal has no meaning if it is not intended to awaken the thought that even the believing petitioner often receives something different from what he asked for, something which perhaps seems to him useless and injurious, and yet cannot possibly be so. But this case will only occur where the disciple asks for something that to him appears needful, and yet is in truth injurious. The closing application has the same bearing. However analogous the relationship seems from which the material for the parable was taken, yet it forms a sharp contrast to what the application refers to. All men were sinners in Jesus' eyes, and therefore even the love of a human father was dulled and weakened by sin. But even this sinful love dare not deceive a son by presenting him with a gift which, in spite of all similarity, is the very opposite of what he asked for. To the best of its knowledge and its means, human love will give good gifts unto its children. And how much more will the Father in heaven—that Holy

[1] The first evangelist introduced these remarks into the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 7–11), but in other respects has preserved them more purely than Luke has done. The similitude of the egg and the scorpion in Luke xi. 12 only adds a fresh figure without throwing any light upon the thought from another side, as the two original parables did. The thought is the fine one, that it is prayer for the Holy Spirit which is always accorded unconditionally, and this special application breaks the force of the truth to which Jesus referred.

One whose gaze is never clouded—give good things to them that ask Him (Matt. vii. 9–11)!

The disciples would often, in days to come, think of these words when they importuned their Father in heaven with the hearts' desires they scarcely dared express before the Master, and with the wishes of the whole people, as well as when the heavens appeared to be like brass above them, and every answer to be delayed. But God would not offer them a stone instead of bread; what He prepared for them by this denial was greater than could be imagined by the heart of man.

# CHAPTER XII.

## GATHERING ON THE EASTERN SHORE.

SCARCELY had Jesus returned to Capernaum and begun to enjoy renewed intercourse with the disciples, when He was again surrounded by all manner of seekers for help, many of whom may have waited long for His return. There was such a turmoil that the little band could have no peaceful converse with each other; there was not even time to eat. But just at this period Jesus specially desired to be alone with His disciples. It was probably not only on account of the rest which He wished them to have after these weeks of unaccustomed wandering; there was much which had to be discussed which could only be done with effect after they had gained experience from their journey. He therefore ordered a boat to be prepared, and commanded them to cross to the eastern shore, where, among the lonely mountains bordering the lake, He could easily find a solitary spot for undisturbed intercourse with His disciples. But it was otherwise decided in the counsel of the Father. Jesus knew not, as He crossed the lake, accompanied only by the Twelve, that the most stormy days of His Galilean ministry were in prospect (Mark vi. 31 f.).

His departure, and the direction taken by the boat, had probably been observed; for, after having been so long without His presence, which had become a necessity for the people, they were not willing to let Him quietly away a second time. Tidings of His return had been rapidly circulated among the towns and villages of the west coast; and when the crowds failed to find Him at His usual place of abode, they determined at once to follow up the hint they got there, and, by rounding the northern end of the lake on foot, to seek Him at that point on the eastern shore towards which His boat had been seen going. We do not know how the crossing was

delayed, but it is certain that when Jesus landed a great crowd had already collected, which hourly increased (Mark vi. 33). There were many circumstances which combined to make this gathering larger than any previous ones. Intelligence of Jesus' appearance had been spread by the mission of the disciples in the most distant neighbourhoods of the province, even in those where the news had scarcely penetrated before; indeed, Mark lays special emphasis on the fact that, in consequence of the mission, Jesus and His operations attracted great attention at the tetrarch's court (vi. 14–16). Wherever the disciples' message found credence, the desire to see and hear Jesus Himself would naturally be created; there was no difficulty in finding out from them the time and place which had been agreed on for meeting, and many made their appearance punctually at the appointed spot, quite ready to follow Him farther on the short hour's journey to the eastern shore. It must be remembered, too, that the feast of Passover was approaching (John vi. 4), and the easily excited populace were already preparing for their pilgrimage to Jerusalem. It is even possible that some of the caravans, which had already gathered, on this occasion took the road through Capernaum, in order if possible to continue the journey in company with this mighty Prophet. It may be that this reminiscence, as often happens, was so exaggerated in the after course of tradition, that it appeared as if tens of thousands were present, who trod upon one another in their eagerness to reach Jesus (Luke xii. 1). But we shall see that, even at a period when a considerable portion of the crowd must have dispersed, those who were collected around Jesus still numbered thousands (Matt. xiv. 21; Mark viii. 9). There is no doubt whatever that when Jesus arrived at the eastern shore, He might easily have withdrawn Himself with His disciples into the mountains without being observed and sought out by the people. But the second evangelist had plainly heard it described by Peter more than once how Jesus, touched with compassion for the flock without a shepherd, forgot His own need as well as that of His disciples, and again devoted Himself to His ministry among the people (Mark vi. 33 f.).[1]

[1] Mark only speaks of Jesus instructing the crowd, but it appears from the striking coincidences of the first and third Gospels that the report in the

A brief narrative, which Luke has preserved from the oldest source, gives a strange picture of the excitement of the crowds that gathered round Jesus (xii. 13 f.). A man from among the people desired to use the influence of the great prophet to forward his temporal interests. He wished Jesus to exert His power in getting a brother of his to give way in regard to a disputed question of property. It is plain that Jesus was then regarded as the chief authority among the people, to whom others willingly submitted themselves; His judicial decision was appealed to, and all that was wanting was to offer Him the regal crown. This made Jesus all the more retiring; although very possibly He might have soothed down the feeling between the brothers by a word of friendly counsel. But He did not wish to give rise to the least idea that He intended to take part in the civil affairs of the people, or to interfere in the ordinary course of justice. He repulsed the petitioner with the curt words, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" But this was not all; He made use of the incident to give the people an earnest exhortation against covetousness (xii. 15). This petitioner had only a mind for the things of earth, and therefore he had not sought the highest and best that Jesus had to bestow, but only the forwarding of his own temporal interests. The great body of the people were more or less of the same mind. It was their attachment to the things of earth, their love of riches and

oldest source of this gathering on the eastern shore gave special prominence to Jesus' healing of their sick (Matt. xiv. 14; comp. Luke ix. 11). In chap. ix., Luke copies Mark in making this concourse take place on the way to Bethsaida (ix. 10), undoubtedly meaning thereby not the town Bethsaida Julias in Lower Gaulonitis, as is generally supposed in order to remove the want of agreement with Mark, but the Bethsaida, on the other side of the lake, we meet with in the commission speech (x. 13), where so many miracles were performed, for, according to the context, Jesus is on the western shore. Luke was plainly guided to this mistaken conclusion by Mark vi. 45, which represents Jesus as making up His mind after feeding the multitude to go to Bethsaida on the west side. In chap. xii., on the other hand, Luke manifestly relied on the oldest source; and xii. 1 shows that mention was made there of an unwonted assemblage. He only introduces the certainly more recent fragments in xii. 2–12 (comp. Book VII. chap. iv.) because the enmity against Jesus which is spoken of in xi. 53 f. reminded him of the hostility which Jesus has prophesied His disciples would meet with. It is probable, therefore, that his source preserved the addresses (xii. 13–34) just in this situation, and that the narrative of feeding the multitude, which Luke anticipates in chap. ix., followed upon it.

possessions, and their desire for pleasure, that led to their seeking from Jesus by preference the healing of their sick; it was this, too, which caused them to regard Him as the Messiah who would fulfil their politico-national hopes, and to show no comprehension for the kingdom of God as He desired to establish it. It was against this covetousness that Jesus warned them, and He sought to make the exhortation more impressive by the parable of the rich fool, who had such a harvest that he had not where to bestow it, but was obliged to take down his barns and erect larger ones. He then thought himself possessed of such abundance as would enable him to lead a careless life of idle pleasure; but that very night his soul was required of him, without there even being time to decide to whom his possessions should go (xii. 16–20).

This parable, which manifestly rests upon a popular proverb (Sir. xi. 17 ff.), proves, as Luke says with justice, that however much man may have of over-abundance, his life is not guaranteed by worldly goods (xii. 15). That is in God's hands, who lengthens or shortens it according to His good counsel; whatever treasures a man may have laid up in granaries will not enable him to alter the decree in the very slightest. The parable is therefore not a mere example of an elementary truth which is often conceded, though seldom paid attention to and practised in life. The application which Jesus made of it was manifestly intended to refer to higher things. What the parable is meant to show is, not that in isolated cases the sudden death of a prosperous countryman demonstrates the foolishness of his trust in his well-filled barns. According to Jesus' own explanation, the teaching was rather that this same bitter undeception, which was experienced by the foolish man, must be experienced ultimately in some form or other by every one who gathers possessions and pleasures together as treasures, and does not take care to be rich before God, *i.e.* in such a way that he will be esteemed rich by God, in whose eyes very different things are of value than mere temporal riches (Luke xii. 21). Precisely because his final fate is dependent upon God alone, man ought to care for His judgment only; he must aim at what is of real value for mankind, if he will not be disabused in the same way. It was involved in the very character of

the covetousness in which the people were sunken, that salvation was supposed to be secured when temporal and politico-national wishes were fulfilled. But the nation was only rich in God's meaning of the term when it yielded itself to Jesus, and was renewed in a religio-ethical sense. So long as it strove after one kind of riches and not the other, it was advancing towards a terrible undeception, such as the rich fool met with when the night of his death came. Neither Jesus nor the people were aware how near was the dark night, when they too would be undeceived.

On this occasion also a smaller band of auditors from among the excited crowds gathered around Jesus. It was to these His more intimate adherents that Jesus then turned with the express injunction to lay to heart what He had just indicated to the people by parable. The rich man thought he had attained everything when he could say to his soul, "Take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry." To attain this end is the endeavour of all whose soul is sunk in the things of this world, and whose days are burdened with its cares. Jesus did not mean to blame the faithful endeavour to provide food and raiment,—the success of which may confidently be awaited from God,—but the over-appreciation of temporal goods, which makes these the highest good, and is therefore in constant anxiety that what is necessary for the requirements of the body even will be lacking. He reminded them that he who has given us our body will add the far smaller things necessary for preserving and adorning it. He pointed to the birds of the air, who neither sow nor reap, nor gather into barns like the rich man in the parable, and yet are nourished by their Father in heaven. Jesus did not intend to prove thereby that, as men, they were beings of a higher order, and were therefore highly preferred before other creatures. He was speaking to His followers as subjects of the kingdom, and had just before described the Creator as their Father. Those to whom He spoke, however, were not merely God's creatures in the sense that the fowls of the air are, but as His children they were the peculiar objects of His paternal care, so that He could not refuse them what He expended upon the others without any exertion on their part. If the meaning, therefore, was not alone that they were more

highly endowed beings than the irrational creatures, the inference was very obvious that they must care for themselves, since they were able to do what the others could not. And yet, with all their care, it was as impossible for them to add a single span to the length of their life as it was for the rich fool, who imagined that his life was secure for many years, and yet was not able to prolong it to the next morning. In respect of clothing, Jesus pointed to the flowers of the field, which labour under no necessity to provide for themselves garments, but have been so gloriously adorned by God, that even King Solomon, in all the splendour for which he was renowned, was not arrayed so majestically as they. This is what God does for the lilies among the meadow-grass, which flourish one day in great luxuriousness, and on the next, when the scorching wind passes over them, are only fit to burn, and "how much more shall He clothe you, O ye of little faith!" The anxiety as to whether we shall have what we require is well suited for Gentiles, for they have no Father in heaven to care for them, who knows best what His children require. The subjects of the kingdom yield up their fairest privileges as children of God, when they try to equal the Gentiles in striving after these things (Matt. vi. 25–32; comp. Luke xii. 22–30). The blue skies of Palestine were never more majestically reflected from the mirror of the lake which shimmered among the mountains, as when Jesus painted this picture of the life, free from anxiety, enjoyed in the kingdom by the children of God.

In saying all this, Jesus had no intention of removing every species of care, He tried to lay upon the hearts of His auditors the one great anxiety which should overshadow all others, "Seek ye first His kingdom." If the kingdom of God was the highest good for the disciple of Jesus, for the coming of which he was to pray at all seasons, the highest aim and object of his constant endeavour must be to forward the kingdom in and around him. What he may need besides, God will give him in good time. As the Lord's Prayer teaches, the kingdom of God, as Jesus meant it, is the community where the divine will is realized upon earth as in heaven (Matt. vi. 10). Only God's gracious operation can bring it to pass that this ideal be

realized more and more in the individual as it is in the community. But His blessing will only be bestowed when the subjects labour and pray unremittingly for this end.[1] In regard to this kingdom of God, Jesus' truest followers thought of something very different from the entire accomplishment of the divine will in thought and life; their first idea was of the temporal blessings which the prophets had ever promised in conjunction with the consummation of the theocracy, and which were to lead the chosen nation to the height of its destiny. But to them the word was, "All these things shall be added unto you." First, there was to be the realization of the kingdom of God in Jesus' sense, and everything else was God's affair. The only question was, whether His followers had actually learned the alphabet of Jesus' teaching. And that would soon be answered. One care only would He remove from their hearts. It was especially those among His followers who had most deeply penetrated into His meaning, who would say to themselves how very small their number was in comparison with the great multitude. Were they, the few, the poor, and the insignificant, really to attain the goal which the nation had failed to reach? Should this little gathering of disciples, this tiny group of true followers, really be the means of the nation sharing in all the glory of the promised kingdom? "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Matt. vi. 33; comp. Luke xii. 31 f.).[2]

The gathering together of treasures is only another form of anxiety for temporal necessities. The foolish man in the parable enlarged his barns in order to accumulate there provision for many years, and just so the avaricious man

[1] Striving *after* does not exclude prayer *for* the kingdom of God, nor does the divine giving render unnecessary the endeavour to provide for temporal necessities in reliance upon God, if only that keeps the position suitable to it.

[2] The palpable reference to the parable of the rich fool, which brings with it the warning against temporal anxieties, shows that these remarks were connected with it in the oldest source, and were therefore spoken in the situation given in Luke xii. 1. The first evangelist introduced it into the Sermon on the Mount, and has therefore added to the striving after the kingdom of God the pursuit of righteousness treated of throughout the whole

heaps up treasure upon treasure in order to secure his after days. "What will it profit him?" Jesus depicted the worthlessness of these transitory treasures with most cutting irony. He first thought of the costly garments eaten by moths; then of the collected food on which the worm fattened; and of the precious metals, protected against moth and rust, being taken by the thieves when they broke through. What man ought to gather together are the treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. These, however, are not the spiritual possessions of the kingdom of God, which may be striven after and attained even upon earth; it is the great reward of which Jesus had said in the Sermon on the Mount that it would be accorded to the faithful disciple (Matt. v. 12), and which the rich man whom He offered to make a disciple was to have gained by the sacrifice of all temporal possessions (Mark x. 21). When he strives zealously for the forwarding of the kingdom, and continues faithful in the exercise of righteousness, the subject of the kingdom gathers together an ever-increasing treasure in heaven (Matt. vi. 4, 18), which will be his reward at the final retribution. There is no doubt whatever that in the sense in which Jesus meant it, this reward will consist of the heavenly consummation of God's kingdom. What is spoken of here is not a reward, arbitrarily fixed upon, which has no connection with the performance; but the attainment of the end is promised to the faithful endeavour. However earnest and unremitting that may be, the highest end can never be attained on earth, though it shall be in heaven. It is towards this heavenly consummation that the heart's desire of the disciple of Jesus must be directed; for he who does not

address (Matt. vi. 33), correctly explaining the radical sense in which Jesus required an endeavour after the kingdom of God. The remark about the little flock (Luke xii. 32) was probably somewhat incomprehensible to the first evangelist in this connection, and he replaced it by a gnome, undoubtedly taken from genuine tradition, which gives a practical direction as to how people may disaccustom themselves from indulging in cares. Anxiety for the morrow is not to be taken, for that only doubles the distress about to-day without removing any portion of what must come. If people restrict their anxiety to the day, every hour which passes will show how needless it was, and thus anxiety itself will be removed (Matt. vi. 34).

wish to possess the highest good both in whole and in part, has never yet recognised its true value. The only thing upon which the heart ought to be set is the accumulation of heavenly treasures. Indeed, the more the disciple is conscious of having secured to himself participation in its heavenly consummation by his genuine endeavours for the kingdom of God, he will be the more certain of having his greatest treasure where all his love and desires are directed. "For where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also" (Matt. vi. 19–21).[1]

It was in this speech, which referred to striving after the kingdom of God in contradistinction to the cares of earth and the gathering together of temporal treasures, that Jesus first pointed emphatically to heavenly riches, *i.e.* the heavenly consummation of the kingdom. But it is to misunderstand Him completely, to infer from this that He only thought of that kingdom as belonging to the other world, and that all He intended was the faithful preparation of human souls for heaven. The kingdom of God, as He conceived and desired to establish it, was the consummation of the theocracy in Israel as all the prophets had promised, and as the people expected would take place. But in addition to this He held one thing fast, with which the people would have nothing to do, namely, the certainty that the kingdom of God could only pour its blessings upon the exterior life of the nation after it had been realized in the hearts of men through genuine repentance and the fulfilment of the divine will as Jesus meant it to be done. In this address, too, His ultimate aim was to turn the worldliness of the people,—a disposition

[1] The first evangelist has put this portion of the speech before what seemed to him the most important part, more especially the exhortation to strive after the kingdom of God (vi. 33). But according to the simple tenor of the words, he has undoubtedly preserved it more purely than Luke, who thought it necessary to add here some peculiarly important injunctions to sell temporal possessions and employ them in alms (xii. 33 f.); it seemed to him that only so could the heart be disengaged from them, and be able to devote itself to the gathering of heavenly treasures (comp. p. 248). He also describes the heavenly treasure as one that never fails, and which is contained in purses that never get old. This most original picture, which may very probably go back upon some recorded statement of Jesus, cannot possibly be original in this place, for even the continuation as Luke gives it shows that what was spoken of was the facility with which earthly treasures disappear.

which affected even His own followers,—and direct it to the one thing necessary, namely, to the moral and religious realization of the kingdom of God. But He was increasingly conscious that His preaching was to deaf ears, and that the kingdom which He desired was not the object of their highest endeavour. The hope gradually faded of there ever being in Israel such a consummation of the kingdom as He laboured for; He had more and more to direct His gaze to the final end, whose realization was not dependent upon the conduct of the people. But even if the promised and longed-for perfecting of the theocracy of Israel had taken place then, that would not have been the final consummation of the kingdom of God. The earth with its finitude and transitoriness cannot be the scene of God's everlasting kingdom; and Jesus never held out the prospect that there would ever in this life be a complete vanquishing of sin. The normal course of development for His operation would have been to labour for an earthly realization of the kingdom of God, which answered to the nation's hopes for the future, and to concentrate upon this undertaking all the powers of His adherents, after they had been made fit for the task by the religious and ethical regeneration He had wrought in them. But the hope of winning the people over to His view of the kingdom diminished from day to day, and every attempt to make the purpose of His followers the indirect realization of the kingdom according to the forms of the Israelitish theocracy, would only have resulted in rousing their worldly expectations, and have induced them to enter upon a Messianic revolt. As time went on, all that was left for Jesus to do was to direct His own and His disciples' gaze to that final celestial consummation of the kingdom of God, the full comprehension of which was the only guarantee and the most powerful motive for an apprehensive grasp of His conception of it.

That this was something entirely new is acknowledged far too little. The ancient world was essentially a world on this side the grave; even the divine revelation of the Old Covenant had not broken through these limitations. But this new thing is certainly not to be taken in the sense in which the older rationalism regarded the immortality of the soul, as a

new doctrine presented by Christianity, which formed indeed its radical germ. Belief in the existence of the human soul after death was not unknown either to Jews or Gentiles; but so long as knowledge was essentially confined to this life, that beyond the grave was only the shadowy existence of Hades or Sheol, which could not be called real being. The divine revelation of the Old Testament had sent a ray of light even into this obscurity, awakening in devout souls an anticipation of an undisturbed connection with the God of all salvation. The spiritualism of Gentile philosophy, however, endeavoured to idealize this faith by the abstraction of a pure spirit, freed from the shackles of the body. When it did not coincide with this Hellenism, post-exilian Judaism, in connection with the Messianic idea, indulged in the hope of a resurrection of the body, and revelled in sensuous pictures of an earthly kingdom which would be shared in by the reawakened patriarchs along with all the devout souls of the Old Covenant. The usual idea is that Jesus and His apostles made use of this expectation; but that is another crass misconception of His real thoughts, just as His supposed connection with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul ends in lessening its value. We possess in regard to this subject a categorical and unhesitating statement by Jesus, the importance of which is far too little attended to. It is well known that at that period the question of resurrection was a subject of dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees (comp. vol. i. p. 289), and that in regard to it Jesus had taken up a distinct position in one of His controversies with the Sadducees.[1]

The Sadducees had once before endeavoured to get the opinion of this renowned Teacher upon this burning question.

[1] Mark inserted this colloquy in the series of disputes with which he filled up the account of Jesus' last ministry in Jerusalem (Mark xii. 18–27). On account of the peculiarity of the second Gospel, and the conditions attending its composition, it is no longer possible to decide whether this incident really took place during the last Passover of Jesus' life, or while on an earlier ministry in Jerusalem. There is undoubtedly a possibility that even during His Galilean activity, scribes from Jerusalem,—such as we have repeatedly met with among those surrounding Him (Mark iii. 22, vii. 1),—who were Sadducees, began to dispute with Him. The fixing of the date is a matter of no consequence, for in any case the incident affords a clue for understanding the

The supposititious case, which they employed as a test, was undoubtedly one used in their schools, where the custom was to demonstrate the absurd consequences of the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection. It represented a woman as having seven husbands, and that not of her own free will, but because of the law ordaining the marriage of a brother's wife (Deut. xxv. 5 f.), she had taken seven brothers, one after the other, in order to raise up seed to the childless departed; but even the last one died childless. The question then was, that if all seven rose again, to which of them would the woman belong? They had all an equal right to her (Mark xii. 18–23). The question was certainly insoluble, for nothing seemed to be left but the abominable practice of polyandry. Jesus acknowledged the impossibility of solving it; but He inferred at once that there must be an error in the presuppositions, which He explained by an incomplete knowledge of the Scriptures as the power of God (xii. 24). It was at this point that He began, because that error was common to both parties. Each proceeded upon the assumption that if there was a resurrection, it would only be a rising to renewed earthly existence, which must therefore be passed in accordance with the conditions of this sublunary sphere. But God is sufficiently powerful to create a new form of life, conditioned differently, that is to say, a celestial life like that of the angels, in which there is no such thing as marrying and giving in marriage, and where the sexual relations will cease, for, as Luke correctly observes, an immortal race cannot be intended to propagate itself (Mark xii. 25; comp. Luke xx. 34–36). The second error, which was peculiar to them, consisted in their supposing it possible to argue against the resurrection from the law of Moses; Jesus undertook to prove out of the same Moses that the

view of Jesus, which falls here to be considered. It is evident from the connection in which it appears in Mark that this question of the Sadducees was put with the intention of tempting Him. But it is not clear how this could have involved Him in any conflict with the Mosaic law, nor how a question of casuistry, whose captiousness the Sadducees had probably often experienced in controversy with the learned Pharisees, should have been intended to lead Him astray. It can scarcely be assumed with certainty on one occasion even that the Sadducees supposed Jesus would share the Pharisaic view in regard to this point.

resurrection was a necessary consequence of what is propounded by the Scripture itself. He referred, for example, to the passage where, at the time of His appearing in the burning bush, God called Himself the God of the patriarchs, who then had long been dead (Ex. vi. 3). Therefore, He who spoke was not a God of the dead, but of the living (Mark xii. 26 f.).[1] Jesus did not infer from this, however, that the patriarchs still lived; for the existence of souls in Hades is nowhere regarded in Scripture as true life in the fullest sense of the word. He distinctly said that in this passage Scripture assumed that the dead would rise again, and attain to a perfect life, in which every personal relation would not only be taken up again, but would then alone be perfectly realized. This life would be that angelic, celestial existence which at the resurrection will replace the old condition.

With this answer Jesus broke, once for all, through the ban which lay upon Pharisees as well as Sadducees, because their knowledge was confined to this stage of existence alone. For the distinction was really not very important, whether life was regarded as restricted to earthly existence, or whether it was assumed that the Messianic consummation would bring about a re-establishment of this life, which would then be endlessly prolonged. But neither did Jesus satisfy His followers with an immortality of the soul that no one entertained doubts of; every healthy feeling tells us that in itself that may be anything rather than a felicity; indeed, in the degree in which the soul finds perfect satisfaction here, this state may mean great misery when once death has loosened the connection with this world. He knew that the created spirit can only attain to a truly contented existence when it enters into a new connection with the world; a new organ was requisite to effect this connection, just as here the

[1] A genuine Rabbinical subtilty has been seen in this, by reason of God commencing by describing Himself as the God who was worshipped by the patriarchs. But in that passage Jehovah distinctly spoke of Himself as the God who had appeared unto the fathers, and all that Jesus did was, according to the view of the whole Old Testament, to regard these appearances as the beginning and the pledge of a personal connection into which God entered with the fathers. Such a relationship, however, could not possibly exist between the living God and dead humanity.

body is possessed of its corporality which brings it into living communication with the outer world. When Jesus spoke of a resurrection, He had in view the re-establishment of such an organ for the soul; but He would know nothing of a re-entrance into earthly life, but only of an exaltation into that celestial existence which is enjoyed by the angels in perfect communion with God; He therefore did not think of the resurrection as a rehabilitation of this earthly body, but as a transformation into a higher corporality qualified for celestial existence. But He neither inquired particularly as to its constitution, nor did He teach His disciples to do so. It was enough that human history did not end with the shadowy existence of Hades, nor even with one that rested in the peace of God. There was to be a new and celestial life in immediate communion with God, when man would be introduced into a new and higher state of existence, though just as real as that in this world, and when he would enjoy himself ceaselessly and labour unremittingly, but freed from all imperfection, physical as well as moral. That was the final, the celestial consummation of the kingdom of God, of which Jesus was as unalterably certain as He was of the love of His Father in heaven; and that love was unceasingly employed in leading humanity to the last and final goal where they would share eternally in its undisturbed blessedness.

From the way in which Jesus thought of that future consummation, it can never be dissociated from the present, nor can it lead to an ascetic depreciation of this life and its possessions, or to an individualistic religion whose exclusive object is to separate the soul from the conditions in which God placed it, making its salvation to consist in future blessedness. This is the same kingdom of God which here begins to be realized, but there is perfected. Only he who here strives for the kingdom of God, and to whom this effort is the central point of his whole existence, can have any share in the consummation of the kingdom which takes place in the other world. But whoever finds the kingdom in Jesus' tidings and appearance, and who through faith in Him has become a subject of the kingdom, he is just as certain of that celestial consummation as he is assured that it has commenced

in the kingdom of God to which he already belongs.[1] The sending of the Messiah is the pledge that God will establish the kingdom of righteousness and salvation, and finally perfect it. It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that Jesus desired to realize this kingdom among His people, and that His desire was not alone to prepare men for that celestial goal, and to lead them to despise their earthly goods and flee from their surroundings. According to His view, the first aim of the establishment of the kingdom in Israel was the religious and ethical regeneration of the people, and then, as a consequence of the same, the welfare of the whole people in all their temporal connections, so that through the mediation of this people the whole earth should share in this salvation. But the earthly realization of the kingdom of God, whether first in Israel or in the surrounding nations which were one day to enter upon its inheritance, was dependent upon the conduct of the people. But that last goal *must* be reached which is conditioned only by God's unalterable decree; it far transcends all historical existence, and will be realized in God's heavenly kingdom. This at once presents a new motive, more powerful than any other, for the continued endeavour to realize it terrestrially. Mankind has never been without high ideals. But an ideal alone has no power to effect its own realization. It is the assurance that it will ultimately be carried out which gives the endeavour towards it a new impulsion and a power that never tires.

It was in this sense that Jesus sought to forward among His followers the striving after the kingdom of God by reference to heavenly treasures, and by the exhortation which is contained in the injunction to gather heavenly treasures.

[1] This is fresh evidence that that profound fundamental idea of the Johannine mystic, which distinguishes the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptics, really rests upon what was propounded by the historical Christ. John regarded eternal life as being had here through the sight of God, which the believer receives in that mystical communion with Christ (comp. vol. i. p. 187 f.), although it is to be more perfectly realized in the other world (1 John iii. 2). But this is that very doctrine of Jesus, according to which the believer possesses in participation in the earthly kingdom the beginning and pledge of its heavenly consummation, which is regarded as being a life spent in eternal contemplation of God, *i.e.* in direct communion with Him.

This was the last inducement by which He could attempt to draw His people away from earthly cares, and to direct their hearts to that high aim which can only be laid hold of in the other world if it is already apprehended in this. The future was to teach whether a different and far higher pledge would be needed to save His people. Tradition has only preserved to us some scanty fragments bearing upon these hours in which Jesus endeavoured with all the power of His soul and all the might of His divine love to win the people over to the acceptance of His ideal. He was Himself conscious of the importance of that moment. It was for some good reason that the Father had led the crowds to Him that day. At last it was necessary to decide whether He had succeeded in breaking the ban of worldliness, which lay upon the hearts of even the best among the people, or whether it was God's pleasure that He should seek and find new methods of attaining His purpose. But Jesus could not know how near the crisis was.

# FIFTH BOOK.

## THE CRISIS.

# CHAPTER I.

## THE FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDES.

EVENING fell on the desolate tableland at the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesareth. A large proportion of the people who had assembled there around Jesus had long returned home; newcomers, however, were always arriving, and thousands still tarried round Him, hanging on His lips, expecting His help, and waiting, now as always, for the moment when He should speak the great word which would promise to all of them help in their greatest need, and the fulfilment of their most ardent desires. Jesus Himself, struck by the importance of the occasion, which, in accordance with the counsel of God, had its place at the very culminating point of His popular activity, appeared, in the enthusiasm of teaching, to have forgotten all about the time of day and the distance from home. It was the disciples who first reminded Him that the day was far advanced, that it was now time for the evening meal, and that the crowd should consider whether the difficulty ought not to be met by their dispersing in order to satisfy their hunger by buying food in the villages, which lay at some distance. They ventured modestly to approach the Master and ask Him to dismiss the people. A word from Him, saying that there had been enough of speaking and hearing to-day, would be sufficient to dismiss the crowd (Matt. xiv. 15).

Jesus met the disciples' intimation in a curious way. Did He perhaps remember what His mother had said at the marriage in Cana, when she pointed out to Him the difficulty that had arisen by the arrival of Himself and His disciples? (John ii. 3). Did He think of the divine supernatural help which had then been afforded Him in order to remove the difficulty? It was really owing to Him that this position of things had arisen, for He had held the people so entranced by

His words that even they forgot how the time was going. It was already too late to bid them return home. Some of them were not in a position to purchase provisions in the neighbouring villages. For that they had to return home, and the way there was long, for many had come from a great distance. But did He not know that His Father's miraculous help was at all times near Him? It was in fulfilment of the divine commission that He had detained the people so long; it was in listening to the word of God that they had got into this difficulty. But Jesus knew that God would help. To the disciples, however, it certainly seemed most incomprehensible, when Jesus replied to their anxious suggestion with deliberate calmness: "Give ye them to eat" (Matt. xiv. 16).

The memory of this moment, and of the feeding of the five thousand which followed it, has indelibly stamped itself on tradition. Not only has the oldest writing of the Apostle Matthew recounted this history, but Mark too, as is shown by his report of the feeding of the four thousand (viii. 1–9), must often have heard it narrated by Peter, with manifold details and unimportant variations.[1] The old view of the Gospels, of course, regarded this as a distinct history; but as far as regards the historical treatment this hypothesis is quite impossible. It is precisely the same story; the discrepancies are merely variations, such as are shown by every oral tradition of an event. No one counted the guests, so that it is the same thing whether the crowd is estimated with Matthew at five thousand (Matt. xiv. 21), or with Peter at four (Mark viii. 9). The accounts are not only too much alike, but they exclude one another; for it is impossible that, after such an experience, the disciples could have shown themselves on a second

[1] The oldest source paid special attention to the words of Jesus; and in this case, therefore, it was peculiarly concerned with demonstrating how Jesus' believing words, which at first seemed so incomprehensible to His disciples, were ultimately fulfilled literally, when they gave the thousands to eat until they were satisfied (Matt. xiv. 19 f.). The short, sketchy, and yet faithful account, which is preserved in the first Gospel, must have been accessible to Mark, for he elucidates it by a series of additions which lead back to an independent tradition (Mark vi. 35–44). Besides, only a report that was fixed in writing could have seemed sufficiently important, in contradistinction with the deviations of his Petrine tradition, for him to regard it as an account of a similar event, from which he took many incidents which served to embellish the first.

occasion as perplexed as they did on the first. The whole significance of this history is destroyed if it is maintained that, after a very short interval, another such collection of people was formed around Jesus. The notable consequences of this event make it quite inconceivable that it was repeated a second time, although without the accompanying result; that of itself would have hindered Jesus from repeating it, even if the opportunity of performing such a deed again presented itself to Him. The Petrine tradition appeared to our evangelist to refer to another event, because, according to this, Jesus Himself took the initiative, and referred to the difficulty in which they were (Mark viii. 1–3).[1] Peter certainly often described Jesus' compassion towards the multitude, and His refusal to allow them to return home without refreshment. As a matter of fact, however, this was only light thrown upon another side of the occurrence; for Jesus could not neglect the pointed intimation given by the disciples, nor could He have given them that incomprehensible command to feed the people, if He had not been animated by profound sympathy—whether articulated or not—with the needy situation of the crowds.

[1] Nevertheless, even he combines the two instances of feeding. He connects with the first the narrative of the expedition undertaken at night by the disciples, which, according to John vi., did undoubtedly follow it; and with the second the demand for a sign (Mark viii. 11), which, according to John vi., stood with equal certainty in closest connection. After the first feeding Jesus desired to go to Bethsaida (Mark vi. 45); after the second, he actually arrived there (viii. 22). We shall see, indeed, how vain was Mark's attempt to keep the two parallel lines of narration separate, which, according to him, are connected with the two feedings; for it is plain that here there is only one and the same line to be dealt with. Thus it is that Mark arrives at no proper explanation of the supposed second distribution; for the hypothesis that the multitude had been following Jesus already for three days, and had brought with them their own provisions (Mark viii. 2), is by no means probable. The first evangelist simply follows Mark's Gospel in the assumption of a second feeding (Matt. xv. 32–38). But even he found it surprising that so similar an incident should have been repeated in exactly the same situation, that is to say, on the eastern shore of the lake within the region of Decapolis (Mark vii. 31),—a neighbourhood in which Jesus was not in the habit of sojourning. It is not usually observed, but from the context it is quite indubitable, that for that reason he transferred the scene to a mountain height on the western shore, and explained it by a ministry of healing of considerable duration (Matt. xv. 29-31). Luke, too, appears to have regarded it as striking that such a great multitude could have been gathered together on the eastern side, and therefore he placed the incident on the way to Bethsaida, on the west coast (Luke ix. 10). Comp. p. 357, note.

But John, too, has given an independent version of this history; for although leaning upon the oldest type of narration, and on Mark more especially, he introduces many details which cannot be explained as an embellishment of the older tradition in accordance with the points of view of its delineation, but must be true reminiscences. It is plainly not the history itself on which the narrator depends, but the decisive events, for which the history gives the points of connection, and the delineation of which occupies a considerable section of this Gospel (chap. vi.), which deals almost exclusively with the Galilean ministry. Thus we hear nothing of the circumstances which occasioned the return of Jesus to the eastern shore, and of the way in which the crowd sought Him out there; nothing of the intimation given by the disciples, and of the exigencies of the situation. The evangelist places us directly in the centre of things. Jesus has gone to the eastern shore; the crowd has followed Him, moved with enthusiasm for the great miracle-worker. When, sitting on the hill with His disciples, He sees the multitude coming, it is He Himself who suggests that they must be fed; and the evangelist conceives of this summons to the disciples as a testing question which was to ascertain whether they would appeal with the same confidence to the divine miraculous help as Jesus Himself did (vi. 1–6). This was the natural course for the occurrence to take in the subsequent recollection of eye-witnesses; they were then aware of the profound signification and important consequences of the incident, and therefore it seemed to them as if the miracle had been premeditated. But even here the description is guided not only by idealistic points of view, but also by definite historical recollections. This is apparent from the statement that the Passover was at hand (vi. 4), which explains the unwonted assemblage of people (comp. p. 356), as well as renders the subsequent events quite comprehensible (comp. chap. ii.); and equally so from the notice that the question was first directed to Philip (vi. 5).[1]

[1] Not only is there lacking here any conceivable motive for such a particular statement, but it is involved in the nature of the case that Jesus should turn to one of them, and that the words, which were also aimed at the others, should appear in the oral tradition as being addressed to all the disciples. Historically

It is quite in accordance with the sketchy manner of the oldest version (Matt. xiv. 17 f.), which was principally concerned with the ultimate fulfilment of Jesus' wonderful words, that the disciples are represented as pointing to their own scanty provision, upon which Jesus set to work at once. The Petrine description depicts more vividly the amazement of the disciples at Jesus' inexplicable demand, by representing them as calculating that at the lowest computation that would mean an expenditure of 200 denarii (Mark vi. 37); they recollected at once, however, that even if they had been possessed of the sum, there, in that desert region, it would be impossible to procure bread in exchange for it (Mark viii. 4). But the need was really very modestly computed, for a denarius would only provide for from twenty to twenty-five men; it was the usual sum at that period for a day's labour (Matt. xx. 2), and would therefore do little more than supply the daily wants of a family.[1] Even so the Petrine account corresponds more particularly with the position of affairs than the older and more fragmentary report, which says that Jesus at once commanded His disciples to see what they had at disposal (Mark vi. 38). But it is not easy to understand why it should have been

it is neither correct to say that Jesus at once thought of provision for them when He saw the multitude approaching, although there was then no cause for anxiety, nor that He encouraged His disciples to expect without any apparently good reason a divine miracle of an unheard-of character. But we have seen already that in Peter's reminiscence Jesus was the first to consider the people's distress (Mark viii. 2 f.); and if in this case His question is a direct call upon His disciples (John vi. 5; comp. Matt. xiv. 16), considering that in the circumstances human help appeared to be impossible, it must have been in order to lead their thoughts to higher assistance. We possess in this a most instructive example of how, in the recollection of eye-witnesses, some details disappear, while others are remodelled according to the general impression made by the entire incident; and others, again, are reproduced in a lifelike manner (comp. vol. i. p. 134 f.).

[1] We thus understand that Philip, who was the first addressed, may have pointed out, as John says, that 200 pennyworth would not be sufficient to give every one a little (John vi. 7). There is of course a possibility that this exact statement took its rise when, after a more accurate estimate of the multitude had been made, the insufficiency of the sum was recognised. But it is not possible that there could be an intentional enhancement of the visibly miraculous character of the occurrence in the fact that the want was calculated at more than 200 pennyworth. What John reports Philip to have said really answers better to the state of the case, for there could be no such wholesale purchasing in that neighbourhood.

necessary to go and look, for surely they must have known approximately what provisions they had by them. It is from the Fourth Gospel that we first get sufficient information as to this point. The disciples themselves were without supplies; but, in obedience to Jesus' command, they tried to find out if something was to be had; and Andrew came back with the intelligence that a young lad was there who had been selling food openly among the multitude, and had still some scanty fragments over (John vi. 8 f.). We thus learn that even the little with which Jesus began the distribution had first to be secured by the disciples through purchase. Even the original narratives were not agreed as to the amount, for the statements were divided between the two cases; and yet this is plainly not a difference on the part of the witnesses, but at the most a slight mistake by him who repeated the narrative. There is nothing strange in the oldest account mentioning five loaves and two fishes (Matt. xiv. 17), while Mark gives the loaves as five, leaving the number of fishes indefinite (Mark viii. 5, 7). But not only does John confirm the oldest account, but he makes particular mention of the fact that the loaves were of barley, such as were commonly eaten in Galilee by the poorer classes; he does not, like the oldest report, mention fish, but speaks only of two kinds of provision,—therefore assuming that, at the side of the lake, fish was used as an accompaniment (John vi. 9).

Jesus had heard enough. He knew that it was all the same to His Father whether there was much or little, and therefore He commanded the disciples to arrange the multitudes in readiness for a meal. Peter must often have described how they were grouped by fifty and a hundred upon the green grass (Mark vi. 39 f.). Such an arrangement was necessary for an orderly and inclusive distribution; otherwise it would have been impossible for the Twelve to supply the people individually, unless, indeed, the meal had lasted for hours, but by this plan each group would receive the needful amount. Besides, only in this way could the numbers be counted, and even so the computation varied from four to five thousand.[1] It is impossible to imagine correctly the great impression made

[1] The reports of the eye-witnesses only give the number of men; but this can scarcely mean, as the first evangelist understood (Matt. xiv. 21, xv. 38), that the

upon the multitude when He who hitherto had only spoken to them of spiritual things, and had apparently quite forgotten their bodily necessities, summoned them all at once to sit down to eat. He had already healed their sick, and would now feed the hungry. But where could Jesus and His tiny company of disciples procure the necessary supplies? Standing in their midst, He seemed like the true "house-father" of the children of Israel. Raising his eyes to heaven and asking God's blessing upon the food, He broke the bread and gave it to His disciples. They then passed through the multitude, giving to each group the needful supply (Matt. xiv. 19). Each table received what bread was thought sufficient, and as many fish as they cared for. The one was necessary to satisfy their hunger, the other was the accompaniment, as John shows us once more in his vivid way (vi. 11).[1] All the reports speak of fragments being left, but it is from John we first hear that Jesus commanded the disciples expressly to gather up the pieces; this version coincides in another point with the oldest account, when it says that each of the twelve disciples got a basketful (Matt. xiv. 20; John vi. 12 f.) of pieces of bread, and not, as Mark supposes (vi. 43), of fish as well, for of these only so much was given out as was wanted.[2]

In regard to this narrative the criticism which fights shy of miracle is not a little embarrassed. The truth is that the occurrence is guaranteed by all our sources which rest upon the testimony of eye-witnesses. These show the independence of their tradition by their deviations, which, however, do not touch the kernel of the matter, and are referable to no tendencies whatever. The idea of the account being either a myth or an invention cannot be entertained. It cannot be a myth, for there is no idea impressed upon the narrative which

women and children were expressly excluded; those present must have been described under the category which preponderated.

[1] John vi. 11 has been regarded as enhancing the miracle; but to say that is to overlook the fact that even the oldest accounts tell how they not only got something to eat, but were perfectly satisfied (Matt. xiv. 20; Mark vi. 42).

[2] It was the later narrative which first exhibited the extraordinary disproportion between the remnants and the original provision, by saying that from seven loaves of which they all eat, seven baskets of crumbs remained over (Mark viii. 8); there can be no comparison, however, between this account and the plainly original one.

seemed to require realization in the life of Jesus. A reference to spiritual nourishment with the word of God, such as appears in the youngest Gospel, might certainly have been made when the fact of a miraculous feeding of the multitude had taken place, but such a figurative representation could not possibly be *à priori* required, and therefore accepted as a fact. The usual explanation of the evangelic narrative really amounts to a theory of free invention which followed Old Testament models.

But criticism itself is sensible how far these nominal prefigurations are from explaining the details of the narrative, and therefore it makes this a prototype of the Christian sacrament. But the truth is that the evangelic tradition preserves in the account of Jesus' farewell meal with His disciples the actual type of the same.[1] We do not require to point out that this fiction, which was nominally composed for didactic purposes, does not indicate its higher significance by a single syllable. What makes any such explanation absolutely impracticable is the connection in which this history appears closely involved; its relation to the return of the disciples, as well as with their voyage by night; its association with the

[1] The Mosaic distribution of manna and quails in the desert (Ex. xvi.) might have been suggested by the locality, and might in so far have formed a *motif* for the invention, if the people required the same supply from the second Moses (John vi. 31). But the Fourth Gospel apprehends it as being something totally distinct, for there it was after the feeding that the people demand a sign (vi. 30 f.). The story about Elisha, who fed a hundred men with twenty barley loaves, from which, in accordance with the word of Jehovah, something remained over (2 Kings iv. 42–44), may perhaps have hovered before our narrators, influencing them in the choice of many an expression. But if this history with its modest dimensions, which scarcely appears to assume an actual miracle, and was enacted under quite extraordinary conditions of famine, was really the *motif* of our narrative, it would have then been no didactic fiction, but a senseless exaggeration of an Old Testament anecdote, having especial reference to the miraculous part. From the solemn manner in which the oldest account describes the breaking of bread by Jesus, it may be that we have here an indication that Jesus acted as the father of the family in the presence of all the people, just as He usually did among His disciples, as for example at the meal before His departure from earth (Luke xxiv. 30, 35). But it is as impossible to explain why a prefiguration of the last supper should have been combined with an imitation of the miracle wrought by the prophet, as it is to explain why wine should have failed and fish been added. The unavailing pains which Strauss has bestowed on this subject only shows that he was more conscious than many critics that a general reference to such parallels explains nothing; indeed, even Weisse preferred to take refuge in the assumption of a misunderstood parable.

height of Jesus' popular ministry, as well as with His retirement from the same, and with distinctly defined localities and events, such as the demand for a sign, whose connection is distinctly impressed even on the synoptic tradition, although it has not preserved their true historical importance. And certainly in the case of John, who was the first to grasp the full significance, the real crisis of Jesus' Galilean ministry is made absolutely incomprehensible when it is attempted to put a freely invented fiction in place of the attested fact which is given there. No, there can be no dispute that on the occasion of this gathering on the eastern shore, something memorable happened which was of peculiar significance. The very utmost that might be done would be to regard our evangelic narrative as a traditionary echo of the event, and therefore to refer what is miraculous in it to the unconsciously invented legend, or the remodelling recollection; and yet in such occurrences, destitute of any miraculous element, there is no conceivable motive that could lead to a real legend-formation.[1]

It is certainly not to be denied, that even with the most perfect readiness to believe in a divine miracle in the strictest sense, this narrative offers peculiar difficulties, for it is totally

[1] Schenkel regarded it as spiritual nourishment which Jesus offered His people, and compared in His speeches with the miraculous manna. But if so, then this spiritual feeding, which was the daily task of Jesus' calling, would not necessarily result in providing supplies for the body. A daily event offers no point of connection for legend, and that change would be no formation of legend, but a palpable error, such as can hardly be attributed to Orientals so accustomed to the use of figurative language. To agree with the older Rationalism of Dr. Paulus, which even now finds acceptance, in saying that this was a popular love-feast celebrated in the desert, where Jesus' liberality roused a mighty development of hospitable and neighbourly feeling, is to overlook the fact that this event, however beautifully it may be depicted, does not offer the slightest point of connection for the fabulous idea that Jesus Himself fed the thousands with scanty supplies. Renan's curious explanation, that people were accustomed to live with the utmost frugality in the desert, and that they regarded these supplies as a miracle, although the necessaries of existence had never been lacking, is heard again from Keim, who himself dares not dispute the authenticity of a narrative which is attested by eye-witnesses. But it is evident, notwithstanding, that the more it is attempted to make this occurrence simple and comprehensible, and to say that "many have already experienced it," the more incomprehensible is the legendary re-formation. But if, in order to be quite right, both motives of the pretended legend-formation are united, it is then plain that two starting-points of such a heterogeneous character could never bring about a unified legendary form.

impossible to imagine what the actual course of events was. In conformity with the nature of any miracle, the divine operation was doubtless invisible; but the result produced must have been perceptible in some manner. In regard to the marriage at Cana, it was possible to think of a divine operation upon the properties of the water, by means of which it assumed the taste and quality of wine; in this case, however, it could only be a strictly divine miracle. But a loaf is no natural product, which can be created by a divine operation instead of through a natural causality, but an artificial production made from material, produced by the most varied of natural processes, by means of an equally great variety of human actions. Even if it is determined that this whole series of natural and artificial processes was replaced by a momentarily divine operation, yet our reports, which are by no means laconic in the description of the details, give no answer to the question as to what stage in the procedure we may suppose this divine action to have taken place. Although it has been a subject of discussion, we may regard it as sufficiently evident that the bread did not increase in the hands of the people or the disciples. But we find no answer to the question whether each of the five loaves grew under the hands of Jesus until a fifth part of the multitude was provided for; or whether after the existing bread was used, He had new miraculously at hand. The latter idea is indeed compatible with the theory of a creative miracle; but there is no support for it in the text itself, since that apparently only leads to the first conception, which is a really monstrous one. It is true that the grace spoken by Jesus over the bread cannot be regarded as hinting at this; for it is Luke's totally secondary account, which is grounded only upon documentary originals, that seems to regard it as a mysterious blessing of the bread, possessing the power of bringing about an increase (Luke ix. 16). The truth is, that our narrative only speaks of there being five loaves (comp. John vi. 13).[1]

[1] Mention has been made of a power of satisfying inherent in the bread, which could with facility be made to mean that the wonder was in the souls of those who partook, who were so excited by Jesus' preaching that they forgot their hunger; but to say this is to overlook how no dissecting knife could

Notwithstanding all these argumentations, it may be said that the course of events is inexplicable; but it must not be overlooked that we are always told how Jesus had no more than five loaves when He began the division, and yet that five thousand were satisfied. Not one of the reports makes direct mention of a creative miracle, such as took place at the marriage in Cana (John ii. 9), and the most that can be said is that something of the kind is indirectly indicated in the latest of our Gospels when it speaks of the twelve baskets being filled with broken pieces from the five loaves (John vi. 13). It therefore does no prejudice to a confident reliance upon our tradition when an endeavour is made to represent the manner in which Jesus was enabled to satisfy the multitude otherwise than by a creative miracle. All we are absolutely certain of is that the intention of every account is to describe a miracle, and this must be acknowledged if the origin of the tradition is not to remain an inexplicable puzzle. But if this be granted, we must necessarily assume that a miracle of divine providence occurred. It is certain that when Jesus began the distribution He possessed a supply that was far from sufficient for meeting the necessities of the case, but He would not have begun to divide it if He had not been perfectly confident that He would receive whatever He needed for the purpose, and that His confidence would not be misplaced. There is no possibility of showing through what divine dispensation His expectation was fulfilled, but it is not thereby inconceivable. It may be that His power over the minds of all who had any provision with them moved them to hand it over to Him who was ready to be their host; or else that, particularly among those who were already prepared for the Passover journey to Jerusalem, there were not a few still supplied with bread and fish; if so much was really collected that there was more than enough for the wants of all, we have here a series of divine dispensations which co-operated to bring about a great result. But it is not merely religious feeling which refuses to pronounce this coincidence the result of accident; the assurance with which Jesus looked

divide five loaves into 5000 portions of any use as food. But no proof is needed that Olshausen's senseless theory of an accelerated natural process is as inadmissible here as in the case of changing water into wine.

forward to the result makes it absolutely necessary to refer it to a miracle of divine providence. This, however, is only an hypothesis to which no one is committed. We are here in the face of a great enigma, and certainly simple faith is not interdicted from keeping to the idea of a creative miracle, while at the same time recognising the impossibility of explaining it. But the historian is called on to show how he, who cannot rest contented with admitting all this, may discover the solution without thereby affecting the essential credibility of our tradition. From both points of view, the significance of the miracle of feeding the multitude is perfectly the same.

But what significance had it then? The answer is, that this miracle not less than Jesus' acts of healing was in the last analysis closely connected with His Messianic calling.[1] This is the reason why all explanations are insufficient which concern the formal side of the miracle. It is a profound thought to suppose that the Spirit, which proceeded from Jesus, accomplished the greatest ends with the scantiest means, multiplying the little by the power of God, and that when faith was united with genuine love in joyous distribution everything was doubled. But Jesus performed no miracles for the purpose of addressing the people in parables. On the other hand, allusion has been made to a representation of Jesus Himself, who, because He was the life, possessed in His human nature what enabled Him to bestow power of life upon men. But it was not Himself that Jesus then offered to the people, it was ordinary barley bread to satisfy their hunger; and He certainly had not come to propound riddles

[1] As against this narrative, Schleiermacher at one time asserted that there could be no grievous necessity in the neighbourhood of inhabited districts, and therefore that there was morally no motive for the miracle. This was to a certain extent undoubtedly correct; for the temporal necessity, which had certainly not gone so far as to cry to heaven, and might assuredly have been helped by timely care, was probably the outward cause, but was certainly not the real motive of the deed. Criticism itself obstructs the understanding of this history, when it begins by regarding a demonstration of Jesus' miraculous power as the only conceivable object of the miracle. But Jesus never performed a miracle merely in order to show that He could do more than other people; neither was it possible for Him to do so, for we have seen that He could only perform these acts when God called upon Him to do so in order to accomplish the purpose of His calling.

in which only the acumen of the expounders can trace these sublime ideas. What He desired to be was the Messiah of His people, *i.e.* He who should be the mediator of the highest revelation of God's grace, the dispenser of spiritual as well as of temporal blessings. That was indeed the aim of the popular preaching with which He had kept the multitude spell-bound the whole day; the establishment of the kingdom of God in the spiritual sense, and the religious and moral regeneration of the people, was what He laboured for and what He demanded of them. But He had told them plainly that those who would strive for the kingdom as He did must give up everything (Luke xii. 31). The prophets had promised the people that when the theocracy was perfected they should receive the fulness of blessings in all things temporal; Jesus did not dispute this promise, or reduce the blessing. The people were to see and to experience that it was He who would completely fulfil this promise also. Just as the miracle at Cana took place at the commencement of His public ministry, so at the height of His activity this token occurred. It was a figurative fulfilment of the Messianic promise, and a powerful practical sermon that He had come to supply their wants and communicate to them the plenitude of blessings even in regard to temporal things.

Can we still question whether the people understood the meaning of this language? The facts will show us that they understood it only too well. The decisive hour had come at last.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE ATTEMPT AT INSURRECTION.

THERE would be an hour when the people should decide whether they would acquiesce or not in Jesus' designs, whether or not they would recognise Him as the Messiah in His sense of the term. Jesus certainly delayed the crisis as long as possible, for every extension of His true ministry among the people must have increased the possibility of winning over a number at least to His conception of the establishment of the kingdom of God. That was the reason for His cautious reticence in regard to the Messianic question, as that had been burning in the souls of the people ever since the days of John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 12). But it is impossible that Jesus could have been mistaken in the fact that the crisis would come, and that quickly, and that in case He were not to succeed in altering the popular feeling, each enhancement of His popular activity would only serve to bring the catastrophe nearer, in which the people would put the Messianic question in their own way. On that day, when surrounded by thousands He once more exercised unremittingly the whole divine power of His word in order to gain the people over to His views, how often may the thought have passed through his mind, that perhaps His Father had ordained that the crisis should come now! Whenever He made up His mind to feed the multitude, and by this miraculous token to unfold the Messianic standard, He knew that the hour had come at last. It cannot be said that the result was unexpected. Jesus had openly proclaimed Himself the Messiah; He was now to hear if the people would accept Him as such, and proceed upon His path to the realization of the Messianic future.

We can understand how a subsequent age, which had long forgotten the historical connections and conditions of Jesus'

ministry in view of the eternal significance of the exalted Son of God, referred the immeasurable importance of the crisis, brought about by the feeding of the multitude, to the greatness of the miracle manifested therein (John vi. 14). Looked at from a historical point of view, however, this is impossible. However we suppose the act was accomplished, whether through a miracle of divine creation or of providence, it was by no means such as could call forth this result by the indirect sensuous impression which it made. How the multitude must have wondered when Jesus bade them sit down to eat, although it was perfectly inexplicable where He would get the means for providing for them; the details of the event would never be visible. All that they experienced was, that in spite of all doubts the bread did not fail Jesus until all were satisfied. The cures of the sick, which had taken place before the eyes of all, must have made a far greater impression upon them. But such an impression was really not required. Have we not constantly seen, that the profoundest motive which brought these crowds to Jesus was really not desire for His preaching, nor even a craving for His miraculous assistance for their sick; but the hope that the Great Prophet, who preached the kingdom of God, would ultimately prove to be He who in the power of God would again establish the kingdom of Israel? It was with such hopes as these that they had followed Him to the eastern shore, and listened for a whole day to His impassioned addresses, probably even being the witnesses of fresh miraculous cures. We are aware of the rate at which the enthusiasm increased, when it was propagated among the great multitudes by the feeling they had of interests in common. This enthusiasm would probably reach its height on that day, and for it there was only one expression, "This is of a truth the prophet, like Moses (Deut. xviii. 15), who cometh into the world" (John vi. 14). Jesus was looked upon as the promised Helper who should bring about the Messianic future. It is probable that He said nothing concerning the fulfilment of the hopes which animated them—His claiming the royal crown and His planning their deliverance from political bondage. But with truly royal liberality He prepared for them a meal; like the father of the family, indeed, like a new father

of the country, He stood among them, bidding them rest at His feet. However simple this meal might be in accordance with the circumstances of the case, He yet interested Himself in their temporal necessities; He had shown that He could not only preach and exhort, or compassionate the need of the individual, but that He also desired to relieve the outward wants of His people. They well understood His figurative speech; this meal in the desert was to them the type and example of that great Messianic feast which was expected to take place in the Messiah's kingdom (Matt. viii. 11). He was the Messiah in the fullest sense of the term.

Now or never Jesus must disclose His final purposes. If He really desired to be the Messiah, He would certainly place Himself at the head of His enthusiastic people, and with miraculous power overthrow the foreign dominion in order thereby to establish the kingdom of Israel in all its ancient magnificence. Could it really be that His intentions were otherwise? Jesus had often before, and even in the addresses of that very day, explained what He desired, and how in accordance with God's good pleasure He must needs fulfil the promise. There had first to be the spiritual realization of the kingdom, and then the Father in heaven would find ways and means to fulfil His promise regarding the outward life of the nation. Now the die was cast. Although Jesus struggled with the whole power of His love to turn the hearts of the people, He did not succeed. The nation had no apprehensiveness for Jesus' conception of the kingdom of God; in every word of His which bore upon it, they only heard the confirmation of their hopes. They could not even conceive of a kingdom of God without the Anointed One ascending the throne, nor would they have anything to do with salvation unaccompanied by political freedom. The people persisted in their opinion. *First* political freedom, and then religious conversion; *first* the establishment of the Davidic kingdom, and then the consummation of the theocracy under the Messiah's sceptre. But was it actually the case that Jesus' design was different from theirs? They had probably spent days in vain waiting for the word of Jesus which would decide it all, and even then they had been with

Him for hours. But Jesus could do nothing without the people; supported by their favour and assistance, the Messianic pretender to the crown might even obtain the throne. The people themselves must take the initiative; they must offer themselves to Him, must even put the watchword in His mouth, which He so unaccountably delayed to utter. The opportunity was favourable. Passover, the great national feast, was at hand; all that was needed was to conduct Him in triumph to Jerusalem at the head of innumerable caravans, there at the centre of the theocracy to proclaim Him king, and then to begin the last struggle for freedom. We perhaps smile at these simple hopes of a people which the iron legions of Rome could crush with a touch. But if so, we forget that this nation believed in miracles, for it could look back upon a history full of mighty acts of divine power. Had not Jehovah, as the approaching Passover put them in remembrance, once before led them forth from the house of bondage with a mighty arm? Had not the great times of the Maccabees shown that a nation is unconquerable which fights for its highest possessions in confidence upon the living God? Indeed, was it not afterwards seen in the history of the vicissitudes of the last revolutionary war what a nation can do which does battle for its sacred things even under the sign of that darkest caricature of religion—fanaticism; and how the policy of conquering Rome was to give way before such forces? But was not God's miraculous arm above all? His aid would not be wanting if this was really His Chosen One; His saving hand must at some time exalt the horn of His Anointed. Then would the new Passover come, when at the head of His enthusiastic people, and accompanied by such miracles as had attended the first deliverer at the Red Sea and in the desert, the Messiah should again break the chains of foreign dominion, and lead His people into the Promised Land of the Messianic age.

This was the Messianic revolution. Once more came the devil of the wilderness to Jesus, "All these things will I give thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." He certainly passed through no struggle when this mournful caricature of His fairest hopes rose weirdly before Him, attracting and yet

threatening. But the work of His life, on which He had spent unremitting labour and warmest love, lay in ruins at His feet. He had not succeeded in overcoming His people; the powers had conquered which rule in the darkness of this world. Him they had not overthrown; now, as once before in the desert, He could say: Get thee hence, Satan! It was impossible to agree to the boisterous importunity of the people, although He knew that by declining He signed His own death-warrant. What passed between Jesus and them during these critical hours we do not know. If up to this time they had been deaf to the profoundest thoughts of His preaching, in their present agitated condition they were at least disposed to listen to further explanations of His plans. There was to be no more delay; what they wanted now to hear was a simple Yes or No. Jesus gave them a distinct negative, although, as His custom was, the refusal would be couched in golden words, which gave while refusing, began something new while breaking off entirely, blessed while punishing, and promised while exhorting. One thing we do know certainly. Even His refusal did not repulse the people; they imagined that with gentle force they could induce Him to undertake what He seemed to shrink from. If it came to the worst, they would force Him to proceed by the storm of popular agitation, even if He had to be carried to Jerusalem and made to accept the crown against His will (John vi. 15). When Jesus saw this, further negotiation was impossible; He could do nothing else but seize the first favourable opportunity and withdraw into the mountains behind; nightfall would prevent any search being made for Him, and the people would be left with their expectations disappointed.

It is certainly hardly possible to suspect from the cold, curt words in which the fourth evangelist describes this catastrophe (John vi. 14 f.), what a momentous crisis this was, although what he says afterwards shows that its great importance was perfectly clear to him. But we must not forget that the disciples were not themselves witnesses. Before these negotiations began, Jesus had bade them go down to the shore and get their boat ready, and ere the end came they were probably far out at sea. Mark tells us how Jesus constrained them to enter the boat immediately after the feeding of the multitude

(vi. 45), and how astonished they were and unwilling to do so.[1] He wished to send the disciples away, that they might not be witnesses of the negotiation with the people, which He saw was approaching. Already the murmur of the popular agitation was audible, and He knew that His disciples were not strong enough to withstand it. There was certainly a distinction between them and the people, but their hopes were alike, and it would have put both Jesus and them in a very awkward position if they had sided with the desires of the crowd. Probably they too suspected what was fermenting among the multitudes, and if they felt that the crisis was near, they would willingly have been present to see and assist. For that very reason He had to force them away before. He dismissed the people. There is no doubt that even the oldest source told of such a dismissal of them (Matt. xiv. 23). But in that connection it is useless to ask what it means. We can understand that as evening fell the disciples would ask Jesus to send the multitude away (Matt. xiv. 15), so that they might seek for food in the neighbouring villages. But now, after the feeding was over, when night was already upon them, why should He have to bid them go? If He entered the ship and quitted the spot with His disciples, the people would disperse of their own accord. It was just in such a situation as this that He quitted them on the evening after the parable-speech (Mark iv. 36). A reminiscence is here preserved, which was manifestly no longer comprehensible to the tradition itself, namely, that Jesus had still something to discuss with the people, which He had to make an end of. We learn from John what this was.

Another point must be considered here. It is not a little striking that in Mark's account, although Jesus bade the

[1] This is how Peter must often have related what happened; but notwithstanding, this conduct on the part of Jesus is perfectly incomprehensible if we only proceed upon the older tradition. The criticism which rejects John's Gospel, and the explanation given there, regards it as nothing but the urgency of the fabulist to prepare everything suitably for the great miracle of walking on the water. This incident, however, is unconsciously to the evangelist a trace of the extraordinary occurrences which were then happening. The fact of his not being acquainted with the more particular connection is owing to the older tradition, in accordance with the conditions of its origin, lacking any report of historical pragmatism; it only gave isolated incidents, without laying any stress upon the animating motives.

disciples go before Him to Bethsaida, while He sent the people away, yet when this was done He did not follow them on foot round the end of the lake, but plunged farther into the mountains in order to spend some time in prayer (Mark vi. 45 f.). It was undoubtedly a very natural thing for the evangelist to suppose that when Jesus sought these solitudes, it was that He might be able to pour out His heart in prayer to God (comp. Luke vi. 12). But there must have been some particular reason for His withdrawing on this occasion when the disciples expected Him to join them immediately; something must have occurred which caused Him to forget His disciples entirely, and to throw Himself upon His Father in heaven. It is only from John that we learn what this reason was.[1] The turning-point of His life had come. It might have been long before the people themselves perceived that Jesus would never fulfil their expectations. But so soon as that consciousness dawned they had done with Him; they could never forgive Him the disappointment of their fairest hopes. Since His last visit to Jerusalem, Jesus knew that the hierarchy had vowed His death. It was only the favour of the people that protected Him from them, and rendered His other enemies, the scribes and Pharisees, powerless. But from this day that favour was to veer round; it was only a question of time. The desertion of the people meant His ruin, and it was that which sent Him to His Father in heaven. Only by ardent supplications could He gain strength for accomplishing His last task—for resigning Himself willingly to death, and so solving the problem which had been given Him.

It was already dark when the disciples began to cross. The waters of the lake were rough, and there was a strong

[1] In regard to this case also, Mark has preserved a reminiscence which is not comprehensible from the connection in which he places it, and must be completed from John's account. Jesus cannot really have bidden the disciples depart for Bethsaida; He can only have told them to wait for Him on the shore, and then if He did appear before nightfall, to go on their way (comp. John vi. 16 f.). He could not know how this transaction would keep Him, or what result it would have, and therefore, as Mark tells, He must have appointed a spot where they might meet afterwards. But when He was at last compelled to tear Himself away from the people, He was not able to take the road leading to the lake, for there He would have been observed, but was necessitated to retire farther into the mountains.

head-wind to struggle against (Mark vi. 48; John vi. 18); but of a threatening storm our sources know nothing. Another kind of agitation excited the hearts of these men, making this evening voyage a far more anxious one than on that stormy night when they almost lost courage amid the raging of the elements. We have seen that they probably had their suspicions as to what was passing upon the mountains, what crisis must be taking place there. And yet they were shut out from it all; they, whom Jesus had made His confidants, were not permitted to say a word when an attempt was being made to induce Him to fulfil the popular hopes. Was it even possible that, without them, the hour was come that would open the way to the throne of His fathers? And if so, it was at this very moment that Jesus had separated Himself from them; He had no need for His faithful followers at this turning-point in His career. While they struggled with winds and waves, straining their strength to the utmost, they must have brooded with feverish excitement over a situation fraught with a problem insoluble to them. It was on this voyage that an incident occurred which seemed to the eye-witnesses plainly miraculous. About the fourth watch, that is, between three and six o'clock in the morning, they were still in the middle of the lake, and according to their own computation, which in the darkness was very uncertain, they must have rowed between twenty-five and thirty furlongs. To recollect that the lake was forty furlongs broad is no assistance to us, for we do not know whether they had to cross it in a straight line, or how far this great wind may have driven them from their course; in any case, they seem to have thought that they were still far from land. All at once they saw Jesus walking upon the sea and drawing nigh the boat; thinking it was a ghost, they cried out with terror, until Jesus made known who He was, and quieted them (Mark vi. 47–50; John vi. 19 f.).

This occurrence is not only testified to by Mark, who tells it according to Peter's recollections, but directly by the eye-witness John.[1] If it is supposed to be necessary to rely

[1] The older Rationalism thought it could remove the difficulties of this narrative, lexicon in hand, by attempting to prove that the expression might also refer to one walking by the lake. But no one has any doubt now that this

implicitly upon the fidelity of the apostolic reminiscence, we have here a case in which God's miraculous assistance permitted Jesus to do for the purposes of His calling what is perfectly impracticable under the conditions of ordinary human existence. But the miracle itself is neither greater nor less than that in which Jesus called Lazarus from his grave, or restored the sight of those who were born blind. The difficulty consists in finding any object which could have been served. The saving of the disciples is what is generally thought of; but the accounts say nothing of their being menaced by danger; and even if that had been the case, they might have been aided by a simple stilling of the storm. The appeal to a strengthening of the disciples' faith explains nothing; for that, as has been said with reason, would justify the most remarkable of prodigies. This miracle must therefore have had a symbolic significance. The acumen of expositors has at one time sought to find in it a representation of the resurrection, at another, a prophecy of the fate of the Church; but it has not taken into account that anything of the kind would be perfectly incomprehensible to the disciples, and therefore would not explain the purpose of the miracle. We must therefore keep to its being an experience of Jesus' saving presence after an anxious night passed without Him, —a fact, however, of which they could only be assured through a divine miracle. But even so, the form taken

explanation is as much opposed to the meaning as it is to the letter of the account. Strauss at one time exerted himself to explain the incident by means of some perfectly unsuitable Old Testament parallels. Latterly he has regarded it as a simple symbolic fiction, showing how the Christ, who is at all times near His Church, even although bodily far removed, will bring it assistance even though it be long delayed; and in this case it was done as by Jehovah Himself in the Old Testament (Ps. lxxvii. 20; Job ix. 8, LXX.),—He walked upon the waters. But we must consider that this narrative is given in connection with a distinct historical *moment* in the life of Jesus, and the latest criticism, which regards the Fourth Gospel as a didactic re-formation of synoptic material, must find some explanation for this narrative being inserted where it separates the account of feeding the multitude from the addresses which had reference to that act, although it had no special significance for their didactic purposes. For when a reference is seen here to an imagined corporality of Jesus, that is a distinct contradiction of the general representation given by the fourth as well as all the other evangelists (comp. vol. i. p. 183, note). Such conceptions were first adopted by modern apologetics when it supposed that Jesus' corporality was filled by the forces of a higher world, or regarded Him as being enabled to walk upon the sea by the miraculous power of the Spirit.

by it is somewhat indifferent, and we have seen in regard to similar symbolic wonders—such as the changing of water into wine and the feeding of the multitude—that it was always connected with a previous necessity.

But the next view of the miracle encounters still greater difficulties. Mark expressly observes that Jesus did not intend to come to His disciples or to quiet the stormy winds, but to pass them by (vi. 48); He was first moved to enter the boat by their superstitious conduct.[1] This, however, leaves no room for any real purpose, and reduces the miracle to a mere exhibition. The way in which Mark explains the superstitious fear of the disciples by saying that what they said could be no production of an excited fancy, because all had seen it and were amazed (vi. 49 f.), leads involuntarily to the conclusion that even among the disciples there had been some doubt whether they had actually seen what they believed. Indeed, it is only the more secondary account which represents Jesus as entering the boat, and tells how, after that, the wind ceased, and the voyage was finished in safety (Mark vi. 51–53). The state of the case appears very differently in the account given by the eye-witnesses; in it, as soon as the disciples were willing to receive Jesus into the boat, they were immediately at the land, and therefore this first purpose cannot have been carried out (John vi. 21). All attempts to make the Johannine description agree with Mark's are wrecked upon the unambiguous letter of the statement; indeed, it is incontestable that the evangelist who calculates the distance they had traversed (vi. 19), and who omits anything else of importance, has recorded it as being something specially remarkable that they were immediately at land. But it is impossible that this incident can have been invented in order to magnify the miracle,[2] for it is that which always rouses the suspicion that

[1] In his usual way, Strauss regards this as only an enhancement of the miraculous element, in so far as Jesus walking upon the water seemed to be just as ordinary a proceeding as passing along a road. But if this, then, is only an idea of the evangelist's own, expressive perhaps of a symbolic view of the wonder, if the disciples were only conscious of Jesus' presence, yet there must have been something in Peter's manner of recounting this narrative to lead to this.

[2] It was so regarded by Strauss and his followers, because Jesus passed not over the half, but over the whole lake.

the situation might perhaps be very different from what it appeared to the recollection of the eye-witnesses.

In itself it is sufficiently comprehensible, that in view of the uncertainty of their computation, and of the impossibility of making a straight course against a strong head-wind, the disciples suddenly found themselves at land when they believed they were still out at sea, having struck the shore at a nearer point than they expected. If, therefore, they caught sight of Jesus just as they neared the shore, there would be no purpose in His walking upon the water, or any reason for assuming that it happened. After passing round the northern end of the lake, Jesus was on His way to Bethsaida, which had been fixed upon as the meeting-place; and therefore it may have seemed to the disciples, as they unconsciously approached the shore, as if He would pass them by (Mark vi. 48). It is certainly an impossible assumption to suppose that in the darkness of night, or the grey of early morning, they were deceived, and believed that a figure wandering along the shore was really walking upon the water; such an error would have been explained immediately on their landing. But their alarm can easily be understood, if, without knowing how near land they were, Jesus suddenly appeared before them; and even the supposition that they had seen a spirit is comprehensible, especially as it is clear from Mark that this superstitious idea did not prevail without opposition. It was certainly a most remarkable dispensation, that at the very moment when they came in sight of Jesus, their toilsome journey was finished; in the excitement of that strange night, the fact made such an impression upon them, that they believed they were brought to land by a miracle, and that it was Jesus' presence which brought them assistance. At an after period the idea might easily be formed from this, that Jesus came over the sea on purpose to aid them, and effected the sudden termination of their journey; from this the redactor may have further inferred that the winds and waves were stilled after Jesus entered into the ship. But this is not a legend-formation; the sudden arrival and the meeting with Jesus, which seemed at the time *like* a miracle, was represented as actually such in the later recollection of the disciples, after the general impression made by this wonderful

life, and the recognition of the perfect divine majesty of their Master had thrown a new light upon their experiences with Him, and therefore on the events of that memorable night.[1]

When the disciples were once more associated with Jesus, Bethsaida—which had been fixed upon as a meeting-place—was no longer of any importance to them. Besides, it is highly improbable that after these occurrences Jesus would immediately visit either this place or Capernaum, where He most frequently resided, and where people would be certain to seek for Him first. In so far, therefore, Mark must be right in saying that immediately after landing with His disciples, while it was yet early morning, Jesus left for the plain of Gennesareth, where among its scattered hamlets He could not easily be discovered.[2] For the multitude which He had left behind on the eastern shore the evening before would not give up their schemes and hopes so lightly. Many had doubtless dispersed when they found that the great crisis for which they hoped had not come. But the minds of men were too deeply impressed by the expectations connected with the person of Jesus. What had not been successful one day might possibly be so the next. And thus there were many

[1] There would scarcely be any hesitation in accepting this explanation, which most simply gets rid of the difficulties presented by the narrative, if it were not that the first evangelist, who in general only gives a secondary redaction of Mark's account, has incorporated there an incident connected with Peter, which the Church has long regarded as one of the pearls of the evangelic history (Matt. xiv. 28–31), but is quite incompatible with our view. But if the account be absolutely literal, it must be for quite different reasons that the critical historian inexorably gives it up. Peter's own description, which we have in Mark's Gospel, completely ignores it; the Gospel of the eye-witness excludes it directly; and the evangelist who does give the account can certainly not have taken it from documentary sources, but from an oral tradition with which we are absolutely unacquainted. Judging from its tenor, we can pronounce it nothing but a transparent allegory of the story of Peter's denial. On that occasion Peter audaciously declared that he would follow his Master even to death. On this, he offered to come to Him upon the water; on the one, he drew back when called upon to stand the test; on the other, his faith vanished when he saw the storm, and he began to sink. On this occasion it was the words of his Master which saved him and brought him to repentance; on the other, the Master's hand guided him safely back to the boat. Even in regard to this explanation, it is neither a case of myth nor of legend. This wonderfully poetic description had long been treated as actual history in oral tradition before it was appropriated by this evangelist, who introduced it as history into the only suitable part of his narrative.

[2] Mark certainly represents it as if whenever Jesus was entered into the boat,

who passed the night under the starry heavens among the dreary rocks, waiting for Jesus to come back from the mountains and take His departure for the other side, that they might assail Him again with their prayers. No one knew that long before this He had passed round the scene of yesterday's events, and had taken the road leading from the mountains to the northern end of the lake. Morning at last dawned, and then the people saw that there was really no boat by which Jesus could return home,—that the one in which they had seen the disciples departing had been the only one on that lonely coast. Could He really even then have quitted the eastern side of the lake on foot? All at once they catch sight of other vessels directing their course to the mountains upon which they were. Perhaps it was the disciples returning to yet meet their Master. If so, He will doubtless appear before long where He seems to have arranged to meet His disciples. But no; it is only a fresh disappointment. The vessels were bound from Tiberias, at the south-west of the lake, a district with which Jesus had no intercourse whatever. The people now know that Jesus can no longer be on the eastern shore, but must have already crossed to the other side. They are successful in getting the boats which have just arrived to carry them also over; and they set out at once for Capernaum, which was His usual place of abode, and which He had only quitted the day before. But He was not now to be found there; and when they learned that, there began a searching along the whole coast as far as the plain of Gennesareth, until they did find Him (John vi. 22–25).[1]

and the waters were quieted, the disciples, weary of their voyage, crossed the lake by hugging the shore, and so landed at the plain of Gennesareth (vi. 53); but this conception was connected with his mistaken idea that Jesus joined His disciples upon the high sea. John indicates distinctly that they were not driven far out of their course, but landed at the district they had had in view (vi. 21); in ver. 17 he mentions that this was Capernaum, which certainly was at no great distance from Bethsaida. By this statement he probably only intended to describe the neighbourhood where Jesus usually resided, and did not mean that they landed at that town; it will therefore be most natural for us to think of the northern shore of the lake, where either Bethsaida or, more probably, Capernaum was situated (comp. p. 105).

[1] The newest criticism would have us believe that this lifelike account is only intended to demonstrate that Jesus crossed the lake by means of a miracle. But was not the assumption that He had returned on foot by the northern road very likely to occur to them? They themselves had come that way the day

One reminiscence of this time has also been imprinted upon the synoptic tradition, although after once losing the pragmatic connection with the incidents accompanying the feeding of the multitude, it was no longer in a position to estimate the real significance. It is in a peculiarly vivid description that Mark tells how, as soon as it was heard that Jesus was in the plain of Gennesareth, the people sought for Him in the towns, villages, and hamlets, being always directed from one place to another, for He seemed ever to be in advance of them. The only way in which Mark can explain this is by supposing that the people wished to bring their sick to Him, and as Jesus had apparently only come for a time, were anxious to secure a touch from the great miracle-worker (Mark vi. 54–56). But this is perfectly inconceivable in a district where Jesus had so often been; they had had plenty of opportunities for bringing the sick to Him, and there would be no ground for the supposition that Jesus would only be with them for a short time. It is certain that the people hastened after Him from place to place; but it was not to petition for cures, but to lay before Him once more the ardent desires of their hearts. At last He was discovered, and it is John who vividly describes the nature of the interview which ensued. No one dared propound at once their wishes of yesterday. He was only asked to say when it was He had come thither. This means that on the eastern shore they had awaited His return from the mountains in vain, for He had eluded them by returning to the other side either on foot or by ship; and also that their longings were just as ardent as on the previous day (John vi. 25).

before. When they met Jesus again, it did not even occur to them to ask *how* He had come, but only *when* (John vi. 25). What the evangelist particularly wishes to describe is the importunity of the people; but it is certainly not a token of spuriousness when an enthusiastic multitude hold to their plans, and do everything in their power to carry them out. It was involved in the nature of the case that Jesus should first be sought for at Capernaum, the true centre of His ministry; but John does not say that they found Him there. The discussion as to the sign which He was to give was placed by John in the synagogue at Capernaum (vi. 59). But the apparent appearance in vi. 25–29, that it was directly connected with the meeting with the people, only arises from the circumstance that the evangelist is giving one great picture of the negotiations with the people which resulted from the attempt at insurrection, the detached parts of which would have interfered with the historical view.

Jesus perceived that the people had only sought Him out so perseveringly because they would not cast aside the earthly hopes they had placed upon Him. His reception of the multitude, therefore, was a reproof for their not having seen tokens in all His miracles which pointed to the true significance of His person and work; they only searched for Him because the food which He provided satisfied their temporal necessities. It was of set purpose that He so utterly ignored the fact, for if the feeding of the multitude roused their hopes of the fulfilment of the Messianic expectations, they must have seen in it a token of His Messianic vocation. Since they apprehended that, not in His sense, but in their own, they only expected from it a fulfilment of their earthly wishes, and therefore such a sensuous satisfying as had been theirs on the day preceding, He therefore warned them that the pains which they had expended in seeking Him out should not have been used for forwarding their temporal necessities, but for attaining the one true good which He had come to bring them. It was now that, in connection with the action of the day before, He described this highest good as eternal food in contradistinction to the other which was perishable; it was food which could only be bestowed by the unique Son of man, *i.e.* by the Messiah. He doubtless meant by this His own proclamation of salvation, which not only exhibited to the people the decree of divine love, but also the one way of obtaining salvation. It was as the Provider of this imperishable food that the Father—and He was no other than God Himself—had given Him attestation by permitting Him to perform that miracle on the eastern shore. He had intended the food for the body to point to what He desired to bestow upon them for their true welfare. While the people only regarded it as the earnest of the accomplishment of their highest earthly hopes, they *ought* to have recognised in Him the dispenser of the highest spiritual blessings (John vi. 26 f.).

Could there be any doubt after this declaration that Jesus claimed as before to be the Chosen of God, the Bringer of the Messianic salvation? Although He had now refused to listen to their wishes, all was not lost. The picture of a future salvation was founded upon the prophets, and was fixed in

the hearts of the people. They had therefore to acquiesce in the delay in the fulfilment of their hopes, when He would not use the means which seemed to promise an indirect realization of the same. But delay certainly did not mean disappointment. One thing which they perceived was, that He connected a condition with that fulfilment, as well as a summons which they declared themselves ready to obey. For that reason they asked what the service was through which they could attain the highest good. They were ready to perform it, cost what it might, and would willingly do anything He required if they could thereby attain their end at last. Jesus, however, answered them that they must believe on Him whom God had sent (John vi. 28 f.). There was nothing more. But did they not then believe on Him? Did they not regard Him as the Chosen of God, who would establish the Messianic kingdom? Had they not first desired to place the royal crown upon His head, so as to make this possible for Him? But precisely because He had to fulfil the Messianic vocation in a way which did not answer to their expectations, He was obliged to require the one thing from them—belief in His divine mission, and therefore in everything which He proclaimed as being the will of God. They must retain their faith in His Messiahship, even if He did not answer to their idea of the expected Messiah. They must take Him as He was, and as He must be in accordance with God's good pleasure, without forcing their thoughts and purposes upon Him. It was necessary that they should believe that He would bring about the consummation of salvation, although by different methods and ways than they had expected. But all of them had not such faith.

END OF VOLUME II.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

00111701

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018